

Modern Language Notes

Volume LII

APRIL, 1937

Number 4

LA PRATIQUE ET LA THÉORIE DU RONDEAU ET DU RONDEL CHEZ THÉODORE DE BANVILLE

Comment Théodore de Banville a-t-il conçu le rondeau,¹ c'est ce que je me propose d'étudier ici; et, comme chez Banville la pratique précède la théorie, nous examinerons d'abord les poèmes qu'il a publiés sous les noms de *rondeau*, *rondel* et *triolet*.

Le numéro du *Journal de la librairie* du 22 octobre 1842 annonce les *Cariatides*. Ce recueil contient deux rondeaux aabba, aabR, aabbaR; il s'y trouve aussi deux "rondeaux redoublés" et deux triolets.

Or, dans la *Revue des deux Mondes*² de 1841 avait paru un article de Sainte-Beuve sur Clotilde de Surville, où le critique réfutait l'opinion exprimée par Daunou sur l'attribution à Vanderbourg des œuvres de la "femme-poète du XV^e siècle."³ Sainte-

¹ Si le moyen âge paraît condamné définitivement par la double réforme de la Pléiade et de Malherbe, il serait faux, cependant, de croire que notre vieille littérature disparaît au XVI^e siècle pour n'être retirée de l'oubli que par des érudits du XVIII^e et du XIX^e siècle. La tradition médiévale subsiste à travers les âges classiques et ce que Chateaubriand remet en honneur d'une façon si éclatante, c'est un passé qui n'avait jamais été complètement oublié [H. Jacoubet, *Le comte de Tressan et les origines du genre troubadour*. (Paris, 1923)]. Mais, lorsqu'au XVI^e siècle on étudie le moyen âge poétique, on ne le comprend plus; on en est trop près et c'est ce voisinage même qui fait qu'on n'en distingue pas nettement les traits. Le XVII^e et le XVIII^e siècles connaissent le *genre marotique*, et ne passent guère "la frontière de Marot." C'est M. de Surville ou, plutôt, c'est le succès du *Tableau de la Poésie française au XVI^e siècle* (1828), de Sainte-Beuve aussi bien que celui des *Poésies de Clotilde de Surville* (publiées d'abord en 1803), qui accréditèrent le XV^e siècle auprès des romantiques et réhabilitèrent les *genres romans*.

² xxviii (1841), 353.

³ Le *Journal des Débats* du 4 août 1839 nous informe que M. Daunou avait lu une notice sur la vie et les ouvrages de M. Vanderbourg.

Beuve nous dit que Surville a voulu faire croire à l'œuvre d'un "Charles d'Orléans femme."

En outre, le numéro du *Journal de la librairie* du 23 juillet 1842 fait part de la publication des poésies de Charles d'Orléans par J. Marie Guichard, et le numéro du 30 juillet de celle qu'a préparée A. Champollion-Figeac. Les œuvres de Charles d'Orléans avaient déjà été éditées en 1803, l'année même où paraissaient les poèmes de Clotilde de Surville.⁴

Il y a là une concordance de dates qui est curieuse. Banville s'est-il inspiré des rondeaux de Charles d'Orléans ou de ceux de Clotilde de Surville auxquels on s'intéressait de nouveau à cette époque? Parmi les poésies de Clotilde de Surville se trouvent des triolets (chacun d'eux a une seule strophe) et 17 rondeaux dont le moule est assez varié: 5 riment abāba, abaR, ababaR;—4 ont les rimes ababa, abaR, abbaaR;—2 riment: ababa, babR, baabbR;—2, ababa, abaR, abaabR;—2, abba, abaR, ababaR;—1, abba, abaR, babbaR; et un, abaab, abaR, babbaR.

Les rondeaux de Charles d'Orléans contenant 5 vers à la première strophe sont construits sur le schéma: AABba, aabAAB, aabbaA ou Aabba, aabA, aabbaA. Peut-on dire que le rondeau qui est remis en honneur par Banville, c'est moins celui de Charles d'Orléans que le genre marotique tel que l'ont pratiqué Voiture et La Fontaine? En outre, les "rondeaux redoublés" correspondent à celui de la Fontaine *Qu'un vain scrupule à ma flamme s'oppose*.

Dans les *Odes funambulesques* se trouvent des rondeaux du type aabba, aabR, aabbaR qui ont été composés de 1845 à 1855 et un rondeau composé en 1849 bâti sur le schéma ababa, bbaR, abaabR, très voisin d'un type qui se trouve chez Clotilde de Surville. Remarquons aussi que Musset composa plusieurs rondeaux: deux en 1842 dont le rythme est respectivement abba, abaR, ababaR et abaab, babR, ababbR, un en 1847 ababa, abaR, abbaaR, un en 1849 ababb, aabR, ababbR, et un en 1853 abba, abaR, babbR, dont deux types se remarquent chez Clotilde de Surville.

En 1875, paraissaient les *Rondels composés à la manière de Charles d'Orléans*. Dans la dédicace à Armand Silvestre, Théodore de Banville citait un couplet d'un *rondel* de Charles d'Orléans, *Le Temps a laissé son manteau*. Tous les rondels de Banville sont

⁴ F. Baldensperger, *Le mouvement des idées dans l'émigration française* (Paris, 1924) II, 166-170.

sur le même type ABba, abAB, abbaA, qui est le schéma suivi pour les rondeaux quatrains par les éditeurs de Charles d'Orléans, y compris Charles d'Héricault dont les *Poésies complètes de Charles d'Orléans* furent publiées en 1874. Banville avait aussi publié, outre les deux *triolet*s des *Cariatides*, 24 pièces du même genre (composées entre 1844 et 1859) et 8 encore, en 1868. Ces *triolet*s forment chacun une seule strophe, tandis que celui de Villon, *Jenin l'Avenu*, se lit en deux strophes jusque dans les éditions modernes.

Les éditions des œuvres de Charles d'Orléans et l'influence de Banville ont suscité des imitations nombreuses de ses *rondels*. M. Rollinat compose des *rondels* ABba, abAB, abbaA; L. Tailhade emploie le rythme ABab, abAB, babaA; M. Bouchor, pourtant, s'est servi du rentrement dans un *rondeau* abba, baR, abbaR.

Ne voit-on pas là la marque du crédit dont jouissait le prince-poète; n'est-ce pas le signe de la faveur qu'on accordait au *rondeau* remis à la mode au XIX^e siècle?

Si nous passons à la théorie, nous voyons que Banville est tout pénétré de Marot et surtout du marotisme de Voiture et de La Fontaine. Nous constatons aussi l'influence des publications nouvelles de Charles d'Orléans; mais il semble que Banville n'ait guère pénétré dans le XVI^e siècle et encore moins dans le XV^e; il fait de la poésie gothique, au goût du XVIII^e siècle,⁵ en ne comprenant pas mieux le moyen âge que ne le faisait la *Charles d'Orléans femme* dont Sainte-Beuve venait de s'occuper peu avant le moment où Banville publiait ses premiers poèmes.

En 1872, Théodore de Banville publia son *Petit traité de poésie française*; il s'inspirait du *Dictionnaire des rimes* de Napoléon Landais (Eugène de Massy) et L. Barré, publié en 1853, 59, 63,

⁵ Dans l'*Almanach des Muses*, on remarque plusieurs *rondeaux* et *triolet*s. En 1767 (p. 57), un *rondeau* du marquis de Saint Aubin, aabab, abaR, babaR;—en 1775 (p. 48) un *rondeau* d'un M. Mille, aabbababR, aabbaR;—en 1780 (pp. 27 et 177), deux *triolet*s de M. Davesne; en 1781 (p. 110) deux *triolet*s de M. de la Louptière, chacun formant une strophe;—en 1785 (p. 200), deux *triolet*s par M. Sauterau de Bellevand;—en 1787 (p. 24), une "Chanson imitée d'un de nos anciens poètes" par M. Legrand d'Aussy, et qui se présente sous la forme de deux strophes ABAabAB, abaabAB.

M. Marcel Bouchard parle aussi du genre marotique pratiqué par les érudits bourguignons du XVIII^e siècle et des *rondeaux* qu'ils composaient (*De l'humanisme à l'Encyclopédie*, Paris, 1930, p. 415).

72, de la *Versification française* de P. Richelet publié en 1671, 1677, 1751 et 1810, du *Traité de la poésie française* du Père Mourgues, plusieurs fois imprimé [le *Catalogue de la Bibliothèque Nationale* indique quatre éditions: 1697,* 1724, 1729, 1754; Banville parle d'une "Nouvelle édition . . . chez Joseph Barbou . . .", (sans date)]. Il passe en revue les poèmes à forme fixe; c'est par le "rondel" qu'il commence. Il faut en chercher presque tous les chefs d'œuvre, nous dit-il, chez Charles d'Orléans. Il nous donne une définition du "rondel." C'est une pièce, nous assure-t-il, qui comporte trois strophes: la première est un quatrain ABba, la seconde un quatrain abAB, puis une "troisième strophe de six (*sic*) vers"; mais il semble qu'il y ait là une faute d'impression, car il nous indique que ce dernier couplet est formé d'un quatrain abba, "puis du vers qui commence le Rondel, ramené une troisième fois." Il cite la pièce de Charles d'Orléans, *Le temps a laissé*, telle qu'elle a été publiée par Champollion-Figeac et par Guichard, c'est-à-dire en trois strophes: ABba, abAB, abbaA.

Plus loin, vient le "rondeau" dont "le grand, l'unique maître . . . est Voiture," car "qui donc eût fait les Rondeaux les plus charmants du monde, si ce n'est celui qui avait le droit de les faire pour Mesdemoiselles de Bourbon, de Rambouillet, de Bouteville, de Brienne et du Vigan, et que remerciaient toutes ces lèvres de rose en fleur!" Les rondeaux de Voiture que Banville cite d'après l'édition de 1677 sont faits de trois strophes aabba, aabR, aabbaR, où R indique le premier ou les premiers mots du premier vers.

Pour le "rondeau redoublé," il cite une pièce de La Fontaine d'après l'édition de 1861 (les *Oeuvres* de La Fontaine avaient été publiées en 1819-21, 1822-23, 1826-27).

Le "triolet" est illustré par *Les Prunes* (1858) d'Alphonse Daudet. Le "triolet," nous dit Banville, "se compose de huit vers." Dans les traités de la même époque, on trouve à peu près la même distinction entre *triolet*, *rondel*, et *rondeau*. — F. de Gramont, (*Les Vers français et leur prosodie*, 1876) déclare qu'à l'origine, le rondel n'est qu'une chanson en deux couplets:

* A la B. N. se trouve une "seconde édition, augmentée," publiée à Toulouse en 1697. Cet in-12 contient dans la III^e partie, chapitre 4, pp. 245-254, 8 règles sur les rondeaux et triolets. On lit, dans ce traité, que "le refrain . . . n'est autre chose que la répétition du premier hémistiche" et qu' "il ne peut pas s'étendre au delà mais . . . pourrait ne pas le remplir." Ph. Martinon (*Les Strophes*, Paris, 1911), ainsi que Lanson, indique une édition en 1684.

Cette forme de la chanson persiste, en se régularisant dans les rondels de Charles d'Orléans. . . . Ce sont toujours maintenant deux quatrains sur deux rimes. Les deux quatrains sont à rimes embrassées mais en ordre inverse. En dehors des deux quatrains se trouvent deux vers, un de chaque rime, lesquels commencent la pièce et y reviennent en refrain à la fin de chaque couplet.

Il cite la pièce de Charles d'Orléans, *Allez vous ant, allez, alés*, en disposant les vers de la façon suivante: ABbaabAB, abbaAB et il ajoute:

On divise quelquefois le premier couplet de ces rondels en deux quatrains, dont l'un commence et l'autre se termine par les deux vers de refrain. En cela on fait erreur. . . . Si l'on devait faire une séparation, ce serait après les deux premiers vers, qui sont le motif proposé tant au poète qu'au musicien. . . .

Il nous informe aussi que "dans Octavien de Saint-Gelais, le *rondel* est déjà presque le *rondeau*." Pour le *rondeau*, "il n'y a de répété que le premier vers seul et non plus deux," et "la pièce est formellement divisée en trois parties, savoir deux quatrains à rimes embrassées et disposées de même entre lesquels s'intercale un distique sur les deux rimes; après ce distique et à la fin du second quatrain se trouve répété le premier vers de la pièce." Quant au triolet, F. de Gramont remarque, après avoir cité un poème de Froissart, "la division en deux quatrains est ici complètement arbitraire." F. de Gramont indique pourtant—et cela est digne d'intérêt—que "les rondeaux triolets constituent la leçon primitive et comme l'embryon du rondel et du rondeau."

Becq de Fouquières (*Traité général de Versification Française*, Paris, 1879) examine les différents genres poétiques. Pour lui, le *triolet* "se compose de deux parties": ABaA, abAB;—le *rondel* se divise en trois parties ABba, abAB, abbaAB;—le *rondeau* est formé aussi de trois strophes, aabba, aabR, aabbaR où R est le refrain (premier mot ou premiers mots du premier vers). Le *rondeau redoublé* correspond au moule employé par La Fontaine.

On voit qu'il y a chez les théoriciens une grande incohérence. Ils ne remarquent pas nettement la relation qu'il y a entre le *triolet*, le *rondel* et le *rondeau*; aussi considèrent-ils parfois que le *triolet* ne se compose que d'une strophe ou de deux, que le *rondel* en a deux ou trois; il n'y a accord que pour le *rondeau*.

Il est curieux de voir, dans le *Petit traité de versification* de M. Grammont (4e édit., Paris, 1921), que le *triolet* se compose de huit

vers qui ne se divisent pas en strophes, que le *rondel* "se divise en trois couplets de quatre vers, plus le refrain final; le premier et le dernier couplets sont à rimes embrassées et le deuxième à rimes croisées" (un poème de Charles d'Orléans est imprimé comme suit: ABba, abAB, abbaA). Le *rondeau* y est défini par les rimes aabba, aabR, aabbaR. C'est cette confusion dans la théorie qui fait que de nombreuses éditions coupent mal les vers des poètes du XV^e siècle. Je trouve, par exemple, dans les *Oeuvres* de Villon publiées par L. Dimier (Paris, 1927), que le *Rondeau d'amour déploré* n'a que deux strophes; W. F. Patterson (*Three Centuries of French Poetic Theory*, Ann Arbor, 1935, II, 136) publie ce même rondeau avec trois strophes disposées ainsi: abb, aabR, abbaR. Rien, non plus, ne semble justifier cette différence entre les "rondeaux" et les "rondels" que font Banville, F. de Gramont, Becq de Fouquières et M. Grammont. Il est vrai que les premières formes du rondeau comprennent seulement deux ou trois vers, rarement quatre dans la première strophe, tandis que la deuxième n'a qu'un seul vers suivi du premier vers de la première strophe formant refrain, et que la troisième "compte autant de vers qu'il y en a dans la première strophe, le tout suivi de la répétition de cette première strophe tout entière formant refrain."⁷ Le rondeau auquel on donna plus tard le nom de *triolet* commence déjà à se distinguer au XIII^e siècle. C'est Eustache Deschamps qui donne le premier exemple d'un rondeau dont la première strophe comprend cinq vers. Chez Christine de Pisan, le refrain semble n'être formé que d'un vers; à la fin du XV^e siècle, au lieu du refrain on emploie le *rentrement*.

Ainsi, triolets, rondels, rondeaux sont un même genre qu'il semble qu'on doive diviser en trois couplets. D'autre part, les rondeaux simples d'Eustache Deschamps étaient composés comme suit: AB, aA, abAB, tandis que les rondeaux doubles l'étaient suivant le schéma ABAB, abAB, ababABAB. Dès Christine de Pisan, on rencontre souvent le type Abba, abA, abbaA.

Pourtant les éditeurs de Charles d'Orléans ont souvent donné à quelques-unes de ses poésies la forme ABba, abAB, abbaA. C'est encore ainsi, d'ailleurs, que fait souvent M. Pierre Champion (*Poésies de Charles d'Orléans*, Paris, 1927). Et cela s'explique d'autant plus facilement que les manuscrits n'indiquent jamais le

⁷ G. Raynaud, *Rondeaux et autres poésies du XV^e siècle*, Paris, 1889, p. xxxvii.

refrain tout entier. Seulement un mot suivi de *etc.* marquait le refrain, aussi l'éditeur moderne doit-il rétablir celui-ci d'après le sens, et on comprend combien il peut être difficile, parfois, de décider si l'auteur désirait un ou deux vers de refrain. En tout cas, il est remarquable que le refrain de beaucoup de rondeaux de Charles d'Orléans est formé de deux vers après la deuxième strophe dans les éditions anciennes et n'en a plus qu'un dans l'excellente édition de M. Champion. C'est, en particulier, le cas pour *Les fourriers d'Esté sont venus, Le Temps a laissé son manteau*, quoique M. Patterson (*op. cit.*, II, 131, 132) publie encore ces pièces avec un refrain de deux vers après la deuxième strophe.

Il semble bien que la plupart des rondeaux quatrains de Charles d'Orléans doivent être publiés suivant le schéma Abba, abA, abbaA, ou ABBA, abAB, abbaABBA. Il faut remarquer aussi que, dans le manuscrit même de Charles d'Orléans, il est fait une distinction entre les *rondeaux* et les *chansons*. Pour ces dernières pièces, le manuscrit indique les premiers mots des deux vers ou des trois vers de refrain après la deuxième strophe et seulement un mot du premier vers de refrain après la troisième strophe, ce qui donne un type proche du rondeau: ABba, abAB, abbaA et aussi AABba, aabAAB, aabbaA. C'est à ce premier type de chanson que Banville donnait le nom de *rondel*, réservant le nom de *rondeau* aux pièces aabba, aabR, aabbaR (où R est le *rentrement*), sur le type duquel Marot et surtout Voiture ont composé leurs *rondeaux*. Mais Villon, par exemple, avait déjà utilisé le type abba, abR, abbaR (Rondeau d'amour déploré.—Rondeau de la Prison) et Charles d'Orléans s'était servi du schéma Aabba, aabA, aabbaA, tandis que Marot a employé le moule, abba, abR, abbaR, et même une fois semble-t-il, Abba, abA, abbaR.

Conclusion: Banville ne se représentait pas le moyen âge sans quelque fantaisie; les définitions qu'il donne des triolets, rondels, rondeaux, rondeaux redoublés, ne correspondent pas à ce que ces genres littéraires ont été pour les poètes médiévaux. Doit-on voir, en son *Petit Traité*, "one of the notable monuments in the history and theory of French versification in the XIXth century" (M. Patterson, *op. cit.*, I, 224)? Ce que Banville a défini ce ne sont pas les *genres* du moyen âge, mais bien plutôt ce qu'il se représentait de ces poèmes à forme fixe. Banville se tournait beaucoup plus vers le XVII^e siècle que vers le XV^e. Les premiers rondeaux qu'il

compose appartiennent au type que Voiture avait remis en vogue. Il est important de remarquer, en effet, que dès 1820, on assiste à une série de rééditions des œuvres du grand siècle. L'intérêt qui se manifeste pour l'âge classique augmente le crédit des vieux genres qui avaient été réhabilités par Voiture et les poètes galants et précieux. C'est Voiture (dont les œuvres sont publiées en 1855, 1856, et qui le seront encore en 1879) qui, dit Titon du Tillet, "fit revivre les Ballades, les Rondeaux et les Triolets qui avaient été abandonnées depuis la réforme que Malherbe avait faite sur notre Parnasse, c'est lui qui fit revenir le goût qu'on avait perdu pour Marot."⁸ Les "rondeaux redoublés" que Banville publie en 1842 sont apparemment imités de La Fontaine et c'est encore un rondeau redoublé de La Fontaine que Banville cite comme exemple dans le *Petit Traité*. Il est vrai, pourtant, que Banville aurait pu s'inspirer de Marot dans l'œuvre de qui il aurait pu trouver les modèles de ces poèmes "romans."

À l'influence du XVII^e siècle il faut joindre, il est vrai, celle de Charles d'Orléans et de Villon. Mais c'est là un enthousiasme tardif. Banville ne compose ses rondels qu'après la triple publication des œuvres de Charles d'Orléans par Guichard, par Champollion-Figeac en 1842 et par Charles d'Héricault en 1874, et après la publication des œuvres de Villon par P. Jannet et 1867. C'est en 1875 que Banville écrit, dans son avant-propos aux *Rondels*: "c'est quelque chose peut-être que de tirer de l'oubli quelques-uns [des rythmes] que nos aïeux nous ont laissés en bloc, comme un tas de pierreries enfermées dans un coffre, que le féroce XVII^e siècle a failli jeter à l'eau avec tout ce qui était dedans, sans autre forme de procès." Pourtant, ce que Banville a connu du XV^e siècle, c'est surtout ce qui lui est parvenu à travers le "féroce" XVII^e siècle. Banville ne se rend peut-être pas bien compte que la tradition médiévale n'est jamais brisée et que les premières années du règne personnel de Louis XIV sont marquées par un renouveau de faveur pour la chevalerie et pour les "épiceries" qu'avait condamnées la Pléiade.

Cette distinction que Banville fait entre rondeaux, rondels et triolets semble, en effet, un héritage du XVII^e siècle.⁹ Miss Helen Louise Cohen¹⁰ nous dit qu'au moment où Voiture reprend le

⁸ H. Jacobet, *op. cit.*, p. 57.

⁹ Le P. Mourgues, pourtant, ne fait pas cette distinction.

¹⁰ Helen Louise Cohen, *Lyric Forms From France*, New York, 1922, p. 63.

rondeau on ne reconnaissait aucune relation entre le triolet et le rondeau. Miss Cohen elle aussi semble ignorer que Marot a composé, en 1526, un "rondeau redoublé."¹¹ Nous sommes ainsi porté à nous demander si M. Pauphilet ne s'exagère pas "les méprisantes ignorances du XVII^e."¹² Je crois qu'en étudiant le XVII^e siècle de plus près, on trouvera de nombreux indices qui montreront l'influence du moyen âge sur le siècle de Louis XIV.

Cette étude nous a permis aussi de revoir les éditions de Charles d'Orléans et de Villon. Nous pensons que les éditeurs se sont quelquefois trompés quand ils ont publié les œuvres de ces poètes; ils ont mal coupé les rondeaux et ont mal imprimé les refrains. Nous avons vu aussi que les traités de versification française—sauf, pourtant, l'excellent ouvrage de Kastner¹³—ne donnent pas de notions très exactes des genres traditionnels à forme fixe que nous avons passés en revue. Dans son *Petit Traité*, Banville a fait œuvre de poète plutôt que de critique et d'historien.¹⁴

MARCEL FRANÇON

Harvard University

TWO NATURALISTIC VERSIONS OF GENESIS: ZOLA AND PARDO BAZÁN

In 1883 Emilia Pardo Bazán startled the Spanish world of letters with her book *La cuestión palpitante*. The "palpitating question" was that of French naturalism as preached by Emile Zola and his colleagues. The Spanish authoress found much to condemn and much to extol in the new literary system. Her personal admiration for Zola himself is great. Among the works of Zola which she singles out for special praise is *la Faute de l'abbé Mouret*. The quality she admires in this book is its "descriptive richness."¹ However, there is reason to believe she admired more than just its word pictures.

¹¹ "The rondeau redoublé . . . was devised by Jean de la Fontaine."

¹² A. Pauphilet, "Le moyen âge et le romantisme." *Revue de l'Université de Lyon*, IV (1931), 147.

¹³ L. E. Kastner, *A History of French Versification*, (Oxford, 1903).

¹⁴ Italo Siciliano, *Dal Romanticismo al' simbolismo.—Th. de Banville*, (Turin, 1927), p. 125. J. Reymond, *Albert Glatigny* (Paris, 1936), p. 323.

¹ Pardo Bazán, *La cuestión palpitante* (*Obras completas*, I, 213):

Although it is not at once apparent, there exists a close parallel in plot between *la Faute de l'abbé Mouret* (1875) and Pardo Bazán's *La madre naturaleza* (1887). Both novels are naturalistic versions of the old Bible story of Adam and Eve and the Serpent. Both stories present a modern Adam and Eve turned loose equally innocent in a modern Garden of Eden quite as wild and tempting as the original. In both the part of the Serpent is played by Mother Nature; and in both Nature, the Temptress, turns out to be a more sympathetic force than God, the Avenger, with his artificial standards of morality whereby the pair are judged and driven from their paradise. Since Zola was the first to think of writing Genesis according to naturalism, one cannot help but wonder whether Pardo Bazán's version does not owe something to his inspiration.

To Zola the reproductive act is artistically important. It symbolises the fecundity of life. As a naturalist, Zola rejects idealism, especially the idealism which considers virginity or celibacy to be virtues. Thus the Church, by its emphasis on these virtues of abstinence, becomes for Zola a negative force, symbolic of death, as opposed to life and fruitfulness, as sponsored by Mother Nature. So to Zola the voice of the Serpent in the Garden of Eden was merely the voice of Nature inducing the man and woman to fulfil the law of life and reproduce their kind. The Tree of Knowledge of Good and Evil then becomes the Tree of Knowledge of the Facts of Life; and the avenging God becomes merely the futile negative force of false idealism which would cover the magnificent sexual act with shame and reproach.²

"Pasajes y trozos hay en sus libros que, según su género, pueden llamarse definitivos, y no creo temeraria aseveración la de que nadie irá mas allá. Los estragos del alcohol en el *Assommoir*, con aquel terrible epílogo del *delirium tremens*; la pintura de los mercados, en *El vientre de París*; la delicada primera parte de *Una página de amor*; el graciosísimo idilio de los amores de *Silverio* y *Miette* en *La fortuna de los Rougon*; el carácter del clérigo ambicioso en *La conquista de Plasans*; la riqueza descriptiva de *La falta del cura Mouret*, y otras mil bellezas que andan pródigamente sembradas por sus libros, son quizá insuperables. Con la manifestación de un poderoso entendimiento, de una mirada penetrante, firme, escrutadora, y a la vez con la copia de arabescos y filigranas primorosísimas, Zola suspende el ánimo."

² Cf. what Zola has his *raisonneur*, Sandoz, say in a discussion of his literary tenets in the novel, *l'Oeuvre*, 206: "et surtout l'acte sexuel,

In seeking to write his version of the Bible story, Zola ran into difficulties. In the first place, how could he discover two genuinely innocent persons in the modern world to play the parts of Adam and Eve? In the second place, where could he find a walled wilderness in France which would compare in luxuriousness of vegetation and isolation with the original earthly Paradise? And thirdly, how could he make God expel them from the Garden? It was a hard problem and Zola had to stretch probability seriously in order to accomplish its resolution. He remembered a large walled estate which he had known as a youth in the Midi. This he magnified in his imagination until it became of vast extent and alive with a vegetation worthy of sub-tropical regions. He pictured it as having been completely abandoned for years and scarcely visited even by the caretaker. Zola named the estate—quite appropriately—the *Paradou*. An Eve is found in the person of the overseer's innocent young daughter who has been allowed to grow up untutored and with free range of the Paradou since an early age. The problem of finding a suitable Adam is more difficult: where in France can Zola find a young man of Adam's appeal and innocence? . . . Serge Mouret was one of those young priests who go through the seminary in a mist of pure idealism, a man whose adolescent yearnings have all been turned into mysticism and devotion. Thrown into rude contact with a country parish, the struggle finally brings on an attack of brain fever. Serge has an eccentric uncle who is a doctor; this relative conceives the odd idea of putting his nephew in the Paradou to be cared for by the overseer's daughter. Serge awakes with his memory gone and nothing to remind him of the past. *Et voilà!* Here are our two necessary innocents in the necessary setting. The garden and the sun will do the rest. As Zola wrote in his *ébauche* when planning the book:

. . . Puis ils sont lâchés dans le parc, Ève et Adam s'éveillant *au printemps* dans le paradis terrestre. . . C'est la nature qui joue le rôle du Satan de la Bible; c'est elle qui tente Serge et Blanche et qui les couche sous l'arbre du mal par une matinée splendide. . . Je calque le drame de

l'origine et l'achèvement continu du monde, tiré de la honte où on le cache, remis dans sa gloire, sous le soleil." N. B. All quotations from Zola made in this article are from the annotated *Collection des œuvres complètes*, Paris, Imprimerie François Benouard, 1927.

la Bible, et, à la fin, je montre sans doute Frère Archangias apparaissant comme le dieu de la Bible, et chassant du paradis les deux amoureux.³

Zola succeeds very well in carrying out the biblical symbolism throughout the story. The lovers do not find the secret of life, the solution of their uneasiness, until one day the garden leads them to the sheltered sward beneath the giant *arbre du mal*. It is the tallest tree in the garden; its life is so abundant that its sides burst and creak, and the sap runs down on the ground all about the base of its great trunk. Zola exults in this symbol of fecundity. Then God appears in the person of Frère Archangias, a fanatical and woman-hating friar. The pair are ashamed and hide. But memory returns to Serge and he goes back to his parish. Paradise is lost never to be regained, but, contrary to the biblical story, the lovers are separated. They are parted by the artificial moral bonds of Serge's priestly vows.

We have seen Pardo Bazán's frank admiration for *La Faute de l'abbé Mouret* as expressed in *La cuestión palpitante*. Some years later when she conceived the idea of *La madre naturaleza* it seems apparent that she could not resist making a Spanish adaptation of Zola's idea. Pardo Bazán thoroughly digested the material in her source and has given us a story thoroughly Spanish and thoroughly Galician but nevertheless its debt to Zola appears obvious. As she was faced with the same three problems as the French author, let us see how she resolves them. In the first place what better Garden of Eden could one want than the wild hills of Galicia? Pardo Bazán did not have to draw on her imagination for them, she knew them. Now where to get an Adam and an Eve? She had them already prepared from the complicated happenings of her previous book, *Los Pazos de Ulloa*. There is Perucho, the illegitimate son of Don Pedro; there is Manuela, the legitimate but neglected daughter of his deceased wife. Now it is necessary, in order to modernize Genesis, as Zola did, to have some artificial reason exist, unknown to the lovers, whereby they cannot be married after their act but rather will be condemned by the laws of religion and not only cast out of Paradise but separated. This does not follow Genesis, where the pair continue united outside the walls, but it is the best Zola could do in a

³ This quotation from Zola's preliminary sketch or *ébauche* may be found in the notes at the back of *la Faute de l'abbé Mouret*, p. 418.

modern story to make the forces of morality condemn the fault and evict the lovers from Paradise. Pardo Bazán follows Zola's procedure rather than that of the Bible—the only variation being that she chooses a different moral barrier. Instead of her Adam being a priest who has lost his memory—a very unlikely situation—he is the illegitimate Perucho who has been kept ignorant of his true relationship to Manuela.

Thus the pair grow up together in the wilds, and, although ignorant of the fact they have a common father, they are nevertheless allowed to roam freely together like any bona fide brother and sister. It never occurs to Don Pedro that there might be a love affair some day between his son and daughter. The coming of Don Gabriel Pardo as suitor to Manuela precipitates Perucho's latent affection for the girl and one day they wander far afield through pleasant valleys and by running streams. Going ever farther into the wilderness, as if impelled by some mysterious force, they finally climb a mountain, upon whose bare and lonely summit there stands a great oak tree. Upon the natural bed beneath its friendly shade the lovers lie down, tired and pleasantly excited from their excursion. Mother Nature has led them to the *tree* and there they learn her secret. That night they are horrified to learn their true relationship. Manuela enters a convent and Perucho is sent to Madrid. Paradise is lost, never to be regained, and the lovers are *separated*, just as Serge and his sweetheart were.

That Pardo Bazán is conscious of her imitation is shown by the soliloquy of her *raisonneur*, Don Gabriel, when he is worrying about the two young people who have been wandering over the countryside all day; he says:

—Se me figura que la naturaleza se encara conmigo y me dice: Necio pon a una pareja linda, salida apenas de la adolescencia, sola, sin protección, sin enseñanza, vagando libremente, como Adán y Eva en los días paradisiacos, por el seno de un valle amenísimo, en la estación apasionada del año, entre flores que huelen bien, y alfombras de mullida hierba capaces de tentar a un santo. ¿Qué barrera, qué valla los divide? Una enteramente ilusoria, ideal; valla que mis leyes, únicas a que ellos se sujetan, no reconocen. . . . *

It is to be noted here that she tacitly compares the pleasant valley to Adam and Eve's Paradise and the two innocents to Adam

* *La madre naturaleza* (Obras completas, iv, 283-4).

and Eve; moreover, it is an *illusory, ideal* barrier which separates them; the ideals of family purity and of priestly celibacy are not recognized by Nature's laws; furthermore, Nature admits being the *tempting force*, as she goes on to say to Don Gabriel:

. . . y yo, única madre y doctora de esa pareja, soy su cómplice también, porque la palabra que les susurro y el himno que les canto, son la verdadera palabra y el himno verdadero . . . y para entenderlo, simple, ¿qué falta hacen libros ni filosofías? ⁵

Compare now a few sentences from *La Faute* which parallel this passage very closely; here the garden (Nature) is frankly called the *tempter*:

C'était le jardin qui avait voulu la faute. Pendant des semaines, il s'était prêté au lent apprentissage de leur tendresse. Puis, au dernier jour, il venait de les conduire dans l'alcôve verte. Maintenant, il était le tentateur, dont toutes les voix enseignaient l'amour.⁶

Can there be any further doubt of the intimate relationship of these two novels? They are not merely writing Genesis-up-to-date; that is a common theme. They are writing a naturalistic Genesis in which Nature is admirable, while religion and God are artificial and over-idealistic. There is a marked parallelism of treatment; both have made the same alterations from Genesis; both have been hard put to it for a logical plot explanation for their babes in the wood; both have had to resort to a moral barrier unknown to the lovers in order to have them cast out of Paradise; both have left their lovers separated at the end, whereas Genesis does not. Certainly Pardo Banzán's story owes more to Zola than it does to Moses. As to whether the French or Spanish version is the better work from a literary point of view, who shall say? The adapter is often able to improve on his original.

DONALD F. BROWN

Missouri Valley College

⁵ *Ibid.*

⁶ Zola: *la Faute de l'abbé Mouret*, 252.

LA FECHA DE *EJEMPLO DE CASADAS Y PRUEBA DE LA PACIENCIA* DE LOPE DE VEGA

Nada se sabe sobre la fecha de la comedia de Lope de Vega *Ejemplo de casadas*, a no ser que fué publicada en el año 1615¹ y que no se menciona en *El peregrino*.

Una lectura cuidadosa de la loa que precede la comedia, y que debió haber sido escrita al representarse ésta, nos da ciertas vagas indicaciones sobre su fecha de composición.

Orillas de Manzanares,
entre fértiles cabañas,
donde el mayoral Heliipe
su blanco ganado guarda;
hay tío mil novedades . . .
La hija del mayoral
dicen que agora se casa;
que otro mayoral muy rico
que vive en tierras extrañas,
le ha enviado un mensajero,
y ella, compuesta y galana
con sartales y patenas,
cuentas y arillos de plata,
le recibió esotro día
entre otras muchas serranas;
y al mensajero polido
mil zagales acompañan . . .²

Lope menciona a continuación los nobles que asistieron a esta ceremonia, entre ellos a Juan el de Peñaranda y a "Juan Uceda, nueva planta de aquel ganadero rico, digno de eterna alabanza."³

A la cabaña llegaron
sin tamboriles ni flautas
por no alborotar la novia,

¹ *Flor de comedias de España de diferentes autores*, parte v, Alcalá, 1615, Barcelona, 1616. Chorley dice que "aunque no se mencione en *El peregrino* . . . fué escrita en el siglo xvi" (Rennert y Castro, *Vida de Lope de Vega*, Madrid, 1919, 478). Me imagino que se funda en "the use of old-fashioned royal octaves, a favorite strophe with the Juan de la Cueva school." (*MLN.*, xxiv, No. 7, 199).

Aprovecho esta ocasión para hacer pública mi gratitud al señor H. C. Lancaster, cuyas sugerencias y activa cooperación han hecho posible este pequeño estudio.

² *Acad.* xv, 3.

³ *Ibid.*, 4.

que es, en efeto, muchacha . . .
 Quiso hablar, pero no pudo
 porque el angel que la guarda
 dió por ella el dulce fiat . . .
Dicese que este verano
habrá comedias y danzas;
 Esto hay nuevo en Manzanares:
 perdonad, tío las faltas.
Fecha a veintidós de abril,
primero día de Pascua
que resucitó el Cordero . . .⁴

Los versos "la hija del mayoral / dicen que agora se casa" sugieren inmediatamente cinco fechas posibles: 1585, año en que Felipe II casó a su hija menor, Catalina, con el duque de Saboya; 1593, año en que se trató de casar a la otra infanta, Clara Eugenia, con un noble francés, especialmente con el duque de Guisa;⁵ 1597, cuando Enrique IV, ya convertido al catolicismo, quiso tramar su propio casamiento con dicha infanta;⁶ 1598, cuando Clara Eugenia se casó finalmente con el Archiduque de Austria; y 1612, año en que se negoció el casamiento de Ana de Austria, hija de Felipe III, con Luis XIII de Francia.⁷

Si combinamos esta información sobre los casamientos reales con los otros versos citados podremos descartar inmediatamente las primeras cuatro fechas. He aquí nuestras razones:

⁴ *Ibid.*, 4.

⁵ Este proyectado casamiento jugó papel importantísimo en las negociaciones de paz entre Francia y España. Empeñado en apoderarse del trono francés, primero por la fuerza y luego por la diplomacia, Felipe II propuso el matrimonio de su hija con un noble francés en cuatro ocasiones durante el año 1593. En primer lugar, él reclamó el trono francés para su hija, como nieta que era de Enrique II; en segundo lugar, él consintió en casarla con el archiduque Ernesto; luego transigió con que se casara con el príncipe francés que él escogiera, y finalmente, se decidió abiertamente por el duque de Guisa. Cf. Joseph Croze, *Les Guises, les Valois, et Philippe II*, Paris, 1866, 230, 231-32, 234, 240.

⁶ F. T. Perrens, *Les mariages espagnols sous le règne de Henry IV et la régence de Marie de Médicis (1602-1615)*, Paris (s. f.), 7-8, trae a cuento una intriga del rey francés para casarse con la princesa española que no merece ser discutida, pues, habiendo escogido al bribón Fouquet de la Varenne, como mensajero suyo, se ve, como dice Perrens, "l'intention de ne pas donner trop d'importance à des communications si suspectes."

⁷ Martha Walker Freer, *The Married Life of Anne of Austria*, etc., N. Y., 1913, 1.

Ana Mauricia de Austria contaba once años no cumplidos cuando su padre la concedió en matrimonio al rey de Francia.⁸ De aquí que Lope diga que ella "es, en efeto, muchacha." Si Lope dice que todos los nobles "iban vestidos de prieto"⁹ a dicha ceremonia, ha de recordarse que a causa de la muerte de la reina doña Margarita, el 3 de octubre de 1611, toda la corte estaba aún de luto.¹⁰ Nótese que Lope dice que no hubo ni tamboriles ni flautas. Si como él refiere, "dícese que este verano habrá comedias y danzas," debemos tener en cuenta que los teatros habían sido cerrados a causa de la muerte de la reina.¹¹ El menciona al duque Peñaranda y al de Uceda, y estos títulos no fueron otorgados hasta 1609 y 1610, respectivamente.¹² Finalmente, y ésta es la prueba más fehaciente de que nuestra comedia se escribió en el 1612; "el día que resucitó el Cordero, primero de la Pascua" (para citar a Lope al revés), cayó el 22 de abril en 1612 solamente en el espacio de tiempo comprendido entre los años 1601 y 1684.¹³ De modo que si los negocios matrimoniales que Lope cita no pudieron haber sucedido antes de 1611, como las indicaciones anteriores muestran, éstos tienen que ser los ocurridos el 22 de abril de 1612 como el calendario religioso indica.

Ahora, para mayor comprobación, compárese la relación de Cabrera de Córdoba sobre los contratos matrimoniales que a continuación copiamos con la loa de Lope.

⁸ *Ibid.*, 4, 5.

⁹ *Acad.* xv, 4.

¹⁰ Luis Cabrera de Córdoba, *Relaciones de las cosas sucedidas en la corte de España desde 1599 hasta 1614*, Madrid, 1857, 468.

¹¹ Cf. H. A. Rennert, *The Spanish Stage*, N. Y., 1909, 220. Lope se había quejado ya en dos ocasiones sobre la ausencia de la comedia. En carta al duque de Sesa, fechada octubre 6-8, 1611, dice: "Yo he despedido las musas por el ausencia de las comedias; falta me han de hacer, que al fin socorrían tanta enfermedad como mi casilla padece." Luego añade sobre el mismo asunto: "La comedia ha sentido esta desgracia; con debida abstinencia trátase ya de su resurrección por el bien de los hospitales." Rennert y Castro, *op. cit.*, 204.

¹² Cabrera de Córdoba, *op. cit.*, 394; y Juan Yáñez, *Memorias para la historia de don Felipe III, rey de España*, Madrid, 1723, 52. Dice el primero en relación fechada el 16 de enero de 1610: "Háse dicho que hacían gentiles-hombres de la Cámara, al duque de Cea, nieto del duque de Lerma, porque al padre, (don Cristóbal de Sandoval y Rojas) han dado título de duque de Uceda. . . ." Sobre Peñaranda, cf. *ibid.*, 349.

¹³ J. J. Bond, *Tables for verifying dates*, London, 1889, 138-9.

"de Madrid a 7 de abril de 1612.

. . . El día de Nuestra Señora, a 25 del pasado, fué el embajador de Francia a besar las manos a S. M., y a la Infanta, y a la Infanta Reina de Francia, y el Príncipe, cuyo acompañamiento se encomendó al duque de Alba, el cual juntó todos los señores, títulos y caballeros de esta Corte, que le llevaron desde su casa a la del Embajador. . . (Este) pasó a besar la mano a la Infanta Reina de Francia, la cual se la dió y no le mandó cubrir ni le respondió a la norabuena que le dió, y S. M. respondió por ella, diciendo que se había turbado con la mucha gente que había, pero que le agradecía mucho lo que le había dicho, y estimaba lo que era razón tan buen vasallo como él era; el cual la trató de Magestad. . . Aquella noche pusieron luminarias en las plazas y ventanas, sin haberse hecho otra demostración de regocijo, y por la mañana la Infanta Reina de Francia, en su cuarto había dado de comer y vestido a trece mugeres pobres, conforme la costumbre que tenía su madre en semejante día, y el siguiente se volvieron todos a poner el luto."¹⁴

Me parece que la semejanza de detalles entre esta relación y la loa de *Ejemplo de casadas* es tan exacta que podemos concluir sin temor a equivocarnos que la fecha de composición de dicha comedia es el 22 de abril de 1612.

J. H. ARJONA

Connecticut State College

THE NAÏVE THEME IN *THE TEMPEST* AS A LINK BETWEEN THOMAS SHADWELL AND RAMÓN DE LA CRUZ

It probably would have delighted Voltaire to know that Shakespeare was to tread the French stage first on the booths of the fair where Gilles, the clown, to whom he so often compared him, was wont to appear. For it has been shown that *Georget et Georgette*, a one-act *opéra-comique* given at the Foire Saint-Laurent on July 28, 1761, was probably the first French play containing Shakespearian material to be acted.¹ In fact, Scenes 5 and 6, which represent the first meeting of two innocents brought up in seclusion from the world, are plainly advertised to be "imitées d'une Pièce Anglaise intitulée: *La Tempête*."² Voltaire would have

¹⁴ Cabrera de Córdoba, *op. cit.*, 467-68.

¹ A. C. Keys, *Les Adaptations musicales de Shakespeare en France jusqu'en 1870* (Paris, 1933), pp. 17-22.

² Thus in the libretto (which I have used) found in the Library of

been further delighted to know that these scenes were not taken from the genuine Shakespeare (in his original impurity, as he would have considered it), but were adapted from the translation which the poet Destouches made in 1745 of several scenes of Shadwell's opera based upon the Davenant-Dryden version of *The Tempest*.³ But this is not the end of the career on foreign soil of this much adapted Shadwellian *Tempest*, as it is the purpose of this study to show the entry of this French version into the field of Spanish dramatic art.

It was Sir William Davenant, it will be recalled, who as Dryden's collaborator "designed the counterpart to Shakespeare's plot, namely that of a man who had never seen a Woman." It was he, too, who created a twin sister for Miranda, to provide a mate to this unsophisticated youth.⁴ The presence of such histrionic young innocents, which gives scope for several scenes of suggestive ingenuousness, was fairly common in plays of the Restoration period.⁵ As the awakening of the senses to the tender passion became one of the favorite themes of the theatre in France in the 18th century, we likewise find the subject appearing there with great frequency. Thus the plays of La Chaussée,⁶ Dancourt, Destouches,⁷ and many others are full of innocent young girls who babble frankly of love without knowing its significance. These French *ingénues*, however, while indulging in some equivokes, express themselves with much

Congress. Cf. also O. G. T. Sonneck, *Catalogue of Opera Librettos Printed before 1800* (Washington, 1914), I, 552.

³ Cf. A. C. Keys, *ibid.* The Davenant-Dryden *Tempest* was brought out at the Duke's House, Lincoln's Inn Fields, on November 7, 1667. Shadwell's opera, based on this version, was produced at Dorset Gardens, on or about April 30, 1674. Cf. Montague Summers, *Shakespeare Adaptations* (London, 1922), pp. xli-xlii.

⁴ Davenant's innovations are comprised in Shadwell's opera, which also retains most of the other features. In addition to Summers's work, quoted *supra*, cf. also Ernest Clarke, "'The Tempest' as an Opera," *Athenæum*, August 25, 1906, pp. 222-23, and W. J. Lawrence, "Did Thomas Shadwell write an Opera on 'The Tempest'?" in *The Elizabethan Playhouse and other Studies* (Philadelphia, Stratford-upon-Avon: 1922), pp. 191-206.

⁵ Cf. Hazelton Spencer, *Shakespeare Improved* (Cambridge: Harvard U. Press, 1927), pp. 201-202, Allardyce Nicoll, *Dryden as an Adapter of Shakespeare* (London, 1922), p. 17.

⁶ Cf. G. Lanson, *Nivelle de la Chaussée* (Paris, 1903), pp. 252 ff.

⁷ Cf. J. Hankiss, *Philippe Néricault Destouches* (Debreczen, 1918), pp. 295 f.

more modesty and reserve than their English sisters. The type became particularly refined in the plays of Favart, the father of the French *opéra-comique*.

Though we know very little about Harni de Guerville,⁸ the author of *Georget et Georgette*, the fact that he collaborated with Mme Favart in writing *Les Amours de Bastien et Bastienne*, shows that his choice of this material was not a wholly haphazard matter. In fact, what could be more natural for him than to choose again a theme which had already met with success and was at the time the "rage" in Paris, as evidenced by the popularity which the Favarts and their stage innocents were enjoying? While Guerville found his material in Destouches's *Scènes Anglaises*, which are almost a word for word translation of the equivalent part of Shadwell's scenes, the manner of approach of the two authors is very important as indicative of their attitude. Gone from Guerville are all allusions and similes which make these innocents in the English play talk the language of the most profligate women, or of the most gay and dissolute roués:⁹ in their place we have naïve utterances delicately painting nascent love, and terms born from an innocent heart rather than from licentious instinct.

This false bucolism, which exalts nature and country life, found its best expression in Spain in the *sainetes* that Ramón de la Cruz, the chief exponent of the *genre*, produced. As Cruz adapted several plays of Favart because of their depicting naïve love,¹⁰ he quite naturally fell upon Guerville's play when he needed material of the same kind, and on February 9, 1778, he produced *Juanito y Juanita*.¹¹ Cruz's adaptation adheres very closely to Guerville's original. Tomasa (Morosine), a widow, has decided never to make her daughter, Juanita (Georgette), see a man, as her husband had made her unhappy. Likewise, Jorge (Ursinus), a widower who had been disillusioned in his marriage, has brought up his

⁸ No mention of him is found in Michaud or in Hoefer. This author is likewise not mentioned in Keys's dissertation, quoted *supra*.

⁹ Cf. for example Prosper's speech in the *Œuvres de N. Destouches* (Paris: Lafèvre, 1911), v, 244, and Hypolite's speech, *ibid.*, 255.

¹⁰ Cf. A. Iacuzzi, *The European Vogue of Favart* (New York, 1932), pp. 305-315.

¹¹ Printed in *Colección de saynetes representados en los teatros de esta corte* (Madrid, 1792), Vol. II. Cf. also Emilio Cotarelo y Mori, *Don Ramón de la Cruz y sus obras* (Madrid, 1899), p. 360.

son, Juanito (Georget), in complete ignorance of women. However, when they discover that they are the parents of these innocents, their past matrimonial troubles seem suddenly to be forgotten, and they set out to make up for the time lost, for Jorge proposes to take Tomasa's daughter in marriage, while he offers her his son. This arrangement apparently suits her, for she accepts it at once, and they get ready to draw up the marriage contract, before the lord of the village should come to ask for Juanita's hand for Patricio (Lucas), a young villager, who has observed Tomasa's daughter. Their plans, however, are upset by the fact that Juanito and Juanita have managed to see each other and immediately fallen in love. Then follow the usual scenes of innocent prattle, after which, eventually, Juanito steals Juanita away from all the suitors and the two naïve lovers are united in wedlock.

The Spanish *sainete* is taken directly from the French *opéra-comique*. Cruz introduces only a minor innovation, in adding two suitors, Anton and Perico, to replace the single one, Lucas (Patricio), of the original. In some places the Spanish adaption is a mere translation of its French model. This is particularly the case in those scenes which Guerville took from Destouches's translation of Shadwell's *The Tempest*. Here are, for example, Georgette's words as she first appears on the scene (Sc. 5):

Ah! Maman, dites-moi une chose? Nicole a toujours peur quand nous nous promenons dans le jardin: elle dit que l'homme pourroit bien monter par-dessus les murs. Est-il vrai?

And here is how Cruz puts it:

Juanita. No se me ponga enojada
mamá, y dígame una cosa.

Tomasa. ¿Y qué cosa es?

Juanita. Dice Olaya,
que es muy miedosa, que quando
salimos por las mañanas
a regar nuestro jardín,
por encima de las tapias
pudiera saltar el hombre.

But, as the Spanish adheres closely to its French original, it follows its delicate tenor and omits the vulgarity of the Restoration piece. Instead of two lovers, who under the guise of innocence become devoid of all inhibitions and ladle out all sorts of innuendos

and double-entendres, we have two simple country folk who artlessly explain the sentiments they feel as love awakens in their hearts. It is interesting to note that, while Cruz knew the source of his *Hamleto* (1769), which he translated from Ducis,¹² he did not suspect, when drawing upon the French playlet, that he was rehandling material that through various adaptations traced its origin to the great English poet!

ALFRED IACUZZI

The College of the City of New York

A POSSIBLE SOURCE FOR E. A. BUTTI'S *CASTELLO DEL SOGNO*¹

The influence of Edgar Allan Poe in Italy seems to have been little studied as yet but that his work left traces in Italian literature is indubitable and one of the most striking proofs is the use made of *The Fall of the House of Usher* by the dramatist E. A. Butti in his *Castello del Sogno*.² That both authors have used the familiar buried-alive motif is apparent at once, but that Butti used Poe's story is unquestionable upon even a cursory examination. The debt to the American writer lies in the situation, the characters, the principal episode, and actual verbal echoes.

A disillusioned poet and man of the world, Fantasio, has withdrawn to a lonely mountain fastness with his young convent-bred sister, Ebe. They are not twins as in Poe. They live together with a physician, Logo, whose face, though very homely, is not sinister as is that of Poe's physician. In both authors the sisters are dying of strange maladies: Butti's heroine is languishing for want of normal life and love; the other has a disease which also baffles medicine, a wasting away with occasional attacks of cata-

¹² Cf. Ricardo Ruppert y Ujaravi, *Shakespeare en España* (Madrid, 1920), pp. 50-51.

¹ The texts used are E. A. Butti, *Castello del Sogno*, Milan, Treves, 1919 and the *Works of Edgar Allan Poe*, New York, Thomas Nelson and Sons, Vol. I.

² *Il Castello del Sogno* was first published by Treves in 1910, but was not staged till 1914. See L. Zuccoli, *Prefazione biografica to Intermezzo poetico, Il Frutto amaro, Vortice*, Milan, Treves, 1912, and *Annali del teatro italiano*, Vol. I, 1901-1920, Milan, Casa Editrice "L'Ecclettica," 1921, p. 156.

lepsy. The fourth personage in both stories is an old friend of the isolated man of the world. Fantasio resents the arrival of this intruder from the outside, but is courteous in receiving him. Usher is, however, glad to have the companionship of his friend.

Butti eschews the old manor house for a medieval castle which may easily have been suggested by the lyric in this same story entitled "The Haunted Palace." In this symbolic poem a mysterious monarch rules happily in a strange palace till assailed by sorrow and destruction. So Fantasio rules in absolute supremacy over his small world until deserted by his sister, her lover and all his followers save Logo and a drunken servant. The Italian play closes precisely as this lyric does with the out-rushing of the inhabitants of the castle:

And travellers now within that valley,
Through the red-litten windows see
Vast forms that move fantastically
To a discordant melody;
While, like a rapid ghastly river,
Through the pale door,
A hideous throng rush out forever,
And laugh—but smile no more.

The "hideous" throng of Poe resolves itself into a motley crowd rendered fantastic by the description of various Orientals; and the "discordant melody" is replaced by the *Marseillaise*, which calls these people out of their solitude back to active life in the wake of Napoleon.

The most striking similarity is, of course, that of the burying alive of Madeleine and Ebe. Here even verbal likenesses are frequent. When Fantasio, having imprisoned Angelo, his friend, because he is jealous of Angelo's love for his sister, tells Ebe Angelo is dead, the shock deprives her of every sign of life and she is buried with pomp in a tomb situated just under the room in which Angelo is detained. Angelo is not, as Usher's friend, present at the ceremony, but learns of it from a servant and from Fantasio himself, who comes in grief to his friend. The tomb in which the Italian heroine is placed is reminiscent of Poe's "vault sheathed with copper."

Si, sotto questa torre, nella dura
roccia, s'apre una vasta critta dalle
pareti di metallo, a cui s'accede
per un lungo ambulacro sotterraneo,
anch' esso foderato di lamiera. (Act IV)

Although Poe does not expressly mention a corridor, he speaks of the woman's struggles within the "coppered archway of the vault" and this may have suggested the "ambulacro" to Butti. The night of the episode is strange in both stories. It is sternly beautiful in Poe, without moon, stars or lightning:

But the under surface of the huge masses of agitated vapor, as well as all the terrestrial objects immediately around us, were glowing in the unnatural light of a faintly luminous and distinctly visible gaseous exhalation which hung about and enshrouded the mansion. (P. 174)

Butti's mysterious light is similar:

Un torbido chiarore,
come di mille torce fumiganti,
la stessa luce che avviluppa nella
crista la salma idolatrata, illumina
anche la valle. (Act IV)

Angelo explains the light as "una meteora luminosa" or perhaps a brush fire while Usher's friend suggests not uncommon electrical phenomena or the "rank miasma of the tarn" as an explanation, and drags Usher away from the window. Angelo also drags Fantasio away from the strange sight.

Both Usher and Fantasio express their fear that their sisters have been buried alive and here Butti uses much the same words as Poe but with more elaboration, and, at the close of their lurid descriptions of the probable agony of the buried, each brother exclaims with dramatic effect:

Madman! I tell you that she now stands without the door! (P. 180)

Insensato!

Io ti dico in questo instante mia
sorella è dietro quella porta! (Act IV)

In fact, when the door is opened, there stands the risen dead, dressed in white and stained with blood. In Poe's tale she falls upon her brother and bears him to the ground, a corpse. The situation is more cheerfully romantic in Butti's play, for Ebe falls into the arms of her lover and is borne away to life and happiness.

There can be little doubt that in this instance Butti deserted Ibsen for Poe, combining with the situation, characters and main episode found in Poe, a rather vague philosophical theme, echoes of the French Revolution and the coming of Napoleon.

H. L. NORMAN

University of Chicago

ST. JEROME AND THE FIRST TERZINA OF THE
DIVINE COMEDY

Baldassare Lombardi's widely known commentary of the *Divine Comedy*,¹ many times reprinted² and held in high esteem during more than a century,³ sees in the first terzina of the *Inferno* an allusion to Isaiah xxxviii, 10: "Ego dixi: in dimidio dierum meorum vadam ad portas inferi." This parallel, embracing the central theme of the poem, has been endorsed by many another commentator, e. g. E. Camerini,⁴ A. Kopisch,⁵ and G. A. Scartazzini,⁶ and has become part of the standard stock of *Dantologia*. So far as it has been possible to ascertain, however, none of the innumerable exegetes has chanced upon a paraphrase of Isaiah's text by St. Jerome which comes closer to the wording of Dante's first two lines than the scriptural passage itself. It is a well-known fact that even though St. Jerome was not among his favorites,⁷ Dante was familiar enough⁸ with the works of the *Maximus Doctor Ecclesiae*.⁹ The passage in question is found in Jerome's *Commentarius in Isaiam Prophetam* xi, 38:¹⁰ "In medio vitae cursu, et in errorum tenebris ducentur ad Tartarum." The much-interpreted *nel mezzo del cammin di nostra vita* appears to be a close transliteration

¹ *La Divina Commedia, nuovamente corretta, spiegata e difesa da F. B. L. M. C.*, Roma, Fulgoni, 1791.

² G. Mambelli, *Gli Annali delle edizioni dantesche*, Bologna, Zanichelli, 1931.

³ G. A. Scartazzini, *Dantologia*, 3rd ed. by N. Scarano, Milano, Hoepli, 1906, p. 237.

⁴ *La Divina Commedia di Dante Alighieri*, per cura di E. Camerini, Milano, Sonzogno, since 1868-69 many editions.

⁵ *Die göttliche Komödie des Dante Alighieri*, metrische Uebersetzung mit Erläuterungen von August Kopisch, Berlin, 1842.

⁶ *Enciclopedia Dantesca*, Milano, Hoepli, 1898, II, 1244; cf. also his edition of the *Divine Comedy*, frequently reprinted since 1893.

⁷ On St. Jerome and Dante, cf. Paget Toynbee, *A Dictionary of Proper Names and Notable Matters in the Works of Dante*, Oxford, Clarendon, 1898, p. 324.

⁸ E. Moore, *Studies in Dante*, First Series, Oxford, Clarendon, 1896, p. 60.

⁹ F. W. Farrar, *Lives of the Fathers*, New York, Macmillan, 1889, II, 296.

¹⁰ Migne, *Patrologia Latina*, xxiv, 407 B.

tion of Jerome's *in medio vitae cursu*, and the immediately following *in errorum tenebris* manifestly corresponds to the *selva oscura* of the second line. Thus, the Hieronymic passage confirms the interpretation laid on the "forest" as "the social influences which darken a man's perception of the truth, and prevent him from seeing the right path."¹¹

ARPAD STEINER

Hunter College

PASSAGES FROM THE ANGLO-NORMAN BOOK OF KINGS

One of the items in lot 468 of the Sotheby & Co. sale of July 24, 1935, was an Anglo-Norman fragment (now in my possession) of the twelfth-century *Quatre Livres des Reis*.¹ Aside from the basic manuscript *M* (Bibliothèque Mazarine, 54) which was chosen for the Curtius edition, the Sotheby fragment is the only known text in the dialect attributed to the original. Furthermore, except for *M*, it is perhaps older than any extant manuscript of the *Quatre Livres des Reis*. The present aspect of the fragment suggests that it may at one time have formed part of a binding. Prior to its appearance at Sotheby's, it had been in England earlier and had subsequently passed through the hands of E. von Scherling, Leyden bookseller and publisher of the catalogue-bulletin *Rotulus*.² No further information as to the fragment's previous history has been available to me. Torn on one side and cut with scissors on the other three, it measures roughly 15 x 7 cms. In addition to the 26 lines of text preserved on each side of the vellum remnant, there are indications that the lost pages of the manuscript were double-

¹¹ H. F. Tozer, *Dante, La Divina Commedia, Notes on Inferno*, Oxford, Clarendon, 1902, p. 2.

¹ Edited by E. R. Curtius, *Gesellschaft für Romanische Literatur*, xxvi (Dresden, 1911). Cf. A. Stimming, *ZRPh.*, xxxvi (1912), 743-48; J. Vising, *Kritischer Jahresbericht*, xiii (1913), 244¹, and 87-88²; J. Bonnard, *id.*, xiii, 68-70².

² Cf. i, 18 (February, 1931): "1102a. An exceedingly rare fragment of the first Bible translation, very early 13th century, 53 (*sic*) complete lines, 2 pages on vellum (6:3 inches) (*Li quatre Livres des Rois*). Unrecorded fragment." Mnr. von Scherling has supplied me with the additional fact that he discovered the *Livres des Reis* passages among "a large collection of manuscript fragments coming from England."

columned. Parts of columns *a* and *d* are all that remain; comparison of the Curtius edition with the lacuna between the two parts of the fragment shows that the original columns of the manuscript contained about 35 lines each, and that each column measured 2 cms. by approximately 17.5.

The Anglo-Norman origin of the fragment is not open to question, despite the brevity of its two passages. The following traits, considered collectively, point to this conclusion: use of *u* for *o* or *ou* (*lur*, *ure*, *ruge*); *ei* in *meins*, *fonteines*, *veneient*, *rei*; intercalated *e* (*beverez*, *liverat*, *coverez*); use of *k* and *w* (*ki*, *ke*, *ewe*); final *d* or *t* in *ad*, *apelat*, *levat*, *od*; pretonic *ui* (< *oi*) reduced to *u* in *conussance* and pretonic *ei* to *i* in *aparillerent*; *ceo* for *ço*; continental pretonic *e* replaced by *o* in *bosoin*; effacement of pre-consonantal *s* in the imperfect subjunctive *apelat*; *me* for feminine *ma*.

The first passage in the fragment corresponds to page 178, lines 1-15, in the Curtius edition, and to iv *Regum*, iii, 17-23. The second passage parallels the edition from 179, 23 to 180, 4, and corresponds to iv *Regum*, iv, 11-17. The absence of manuscript variants from the edition removes any immediate possibility of classifying the fragment in the stemma postulated by Curtius. Collation of the fragment (cf. below) with his text shows, however, that manuscript *M* is somewhat superior. Further comparison with the Vulgate as well points to the greater authenticity of *M* in the transmission of iv *Regum*, iv, verses 14 (. . . *quid ergo vult ut faciam ei* . . .) and 16 (. . . *domine mi, vir Dei* . . .). As a significant link in the Anglo-Norman history of the *Quatre Livres des Reis*, the text of the fragment is given in full. Wherever it diverges in any significant respect from the edition, the reading accepted by Curtius is noted in italics between parentheses.

I

" . . . cist chanel ert replenis d'ewe (*de éve*), e vus en beverez e li oz e vos bestes." E ce (*çó*) li est poi a nostre Seignor, mes il vus liverat Moab as meins. E totes lur citez e lur fermetez prendrez e destruirez e toz les arbres ke (*ki*) fruit portent coperez e totes lor fonteines estuperez e toz lur champs de pieres coverez.' Le matin a l'ure ke l'en deust sacrifier (*l'um soleit faire sacrefise*), este vus ewes grandes ke (*ki*) veneient devers Edom come de cretines, sin orent grant plenté e ces (*o. halte p. íces*) de l'ost. Cil de Moab sorent ke li trei rei veneient sor els a ost. Pur ceo s'asemblerent e aparillerent toz cels ki defensable estoient. Si se tindrent en

(a) lur marches e atendirent lur enemis. Par matin, cum li soleilz levat, li rais du soleil ferit (*f. enz*) en l'ewe, si aparut (*parut*) l'ewe par le soleil ruge come sanc. E cil de Moab penserent ke l'ewe fu ensenglanté (*l'éve fust ensanglantée é ruge de sanc*). E distrent entre sei: 'Li reis ke nus sorveneient (*ki sur nus venéient*). . . .'

II

. . . ke li prophetes i vient (*vint*) e jut en cele chambre. Si apela Giezi, son serjant (*servant*), si li dist: 'Apelez (*Apele*) mei la dame.' Cil l'apelat, e ele (*l'a. si vint*) devant le prophete. E il comanda a Giezi (*c. G.*) ke ces paroles li deïst: 'Tu m'as servi (*servie*) sovenement e (*e ententivement*) que vels ke jo te face? As tu nul bosoin a fere ke jo parole pur tei al rei ou al conestable de la chevalerie?' Cele respondi: 'Jo main mult bien e a süefté (*seürted*)* entre mes amis e od me (*ma*) conussance.' Respondi li prophetes: 'E que vels tu (*que volt*) dunc ke jo te (*li*) face?' Respondi Giezi: 'Ne l'estuet pas demander; ele n'ad nul fiz, e sis mariz est veillarz.' Lores comandat ke il l'apelat (*l'apelast*), e ele vint jesk'a (*jésque a*) l'hus. E li prophetes li dist: 'En tens (*t. é*) a cest oure, si jo vif, tu erz enceinte d'un (*de un*) fiz.' Cele respondi: 'Nule rien, beau sire (*Nú faire, bel sire, huem Deu*), ne me di fors si cum il ert.'

CUM GIEZI OUT ENFANT E MURUT E PUIS REVINT.⁴

La parole al prophete averat, kar ele conceut e e. . . .

EDWARD B. HAM

Yale University

ESPREC IN LE JEU DE LA FEUILLÉE

Verse 468 of *Le Jeu de la Feuillée* presents one of those trying puzzles bequeathed to modern editors by some inattentive mediæval Adam Scrivener: a hapax legomenon without kindred or affinity. The dialogue in the play has turned upon the Pope's severity in dispossessing the *clerics bigames* of a certain tax exemption. Gillot says, v. 457, that one clerk, Plumus, "has boasted that if his clerkly learning doesn't fail him, he will get back what was taken away from him at the cost of a measure of tow. It is a lucky thing for the pope guilty of it that he is dead; had he been never so strong and mighty, he (Plumus) would have deposed him,"—and he goes on:

* *Suerted* is the reading of manuscript *M* as recorded by Curtius in a note (p. 179).

⁴ The following marginal note in the Curtius edition (p. 180) corresponds vaguely to this rubric: *Cume li enfes murut*.

Mal li eüst onques osé
Tolir privilege de clerc,
Car il li eüst dit esprec,
Et si eüst fait l'escarbote.

Langlois¹ notes in his glossary that Godefroy does not register *esprec*, and he himself puts a question mark after the word. He cites from Van Hamel's introduction to the *Matheolus* the remark of Eudes de Cheriton that worldly-minded clerks were nicknamed *escarbots*.

A study of the mediaeval texts in which the *escarbote* figures does indeed disclose that in the XIIIth century the *escarbote* (*scarbo*) in homily and apologue symbolised the fleshly-minded clerk. The hankerings of the flesh are similarly represented by the *stercus*, the *sterquilinium*, which the *scarbo* haunts and forever craves. Our own passage from the *Jeu de la Feuillée* dates from 1276, or perhaps a year later, but in any case from a time when the discussions aroused by the decrees of the Council of Lyons were still warm and high. It was because *escarbotes* were everywhere in the Church that the Council had been summoned. At such a time the epithet would be freely used and universally understood. *Faire l'escarbote* would bring up the picture of the dung-beetle at his nasty work, and it would suggest the clerk in name and office who lived immersed in carnal and worldly preoccupations.

If now we examine anew the verses of the *Jeu de la Feuillée* we observe that *esprec* is obviously corrupt. It fails to rhyme with *clerc*.² *Espere* would be no clearer. But the habits of the *escarbote* and the regular association in Latin texts of *scarbo*, *sterquilinium*, and *stercus* suggest that the word miscopied is *esterc* from *stercus*. It would be, like *esprec*, a hapax legomenon, but it rhymes with *clerc* and it is pertinent to the context.

Gillot, who is a person of some education, may well have coined such a word as *esterc* facetiously. *Scarbo* and *stercus* are inseparable. *Esterc*, clearly, fits the situation if we accept the equivalence of *scarbo* and worldly-minded clerk, of *stercus* and worldly-

¹ Adam le Bossu, *Le Jeu de la Feuillée*, édité par. L. Langlois, Paris, 1923.

² That should suffice to condemn it. Adam de la Halle nowhere else in the play takes such a liberty with rhyme. The only imperfect rhyme occurs in vv. 527-528, which show *dit-prist*.

mindedness. "Never," says Gillot, "would the Pope have dared to take his (Plumus's) clerkly privileges away from him, for Plumus would have said "Esterc!" to him, and thus surely have played the *escarbote*." The *escarbotes* could appropriately make "Esterc!" their battle-cry. And Plumus, after uttering this horrific Rabelaisian challenge, "would in truth have shown himself an *escarbote*."

The article by Professor Holmes in the January number of *MLN.* on Villon's verse, "Plus enflée qu'un vlimeux escharbot," makes it possible to specify what Plumus's action would have been. The characteristic explosive discharge by the *escarbote*, or bombardier beetle, would lend to *faire l'escarbote* the additional sense of *pedere*. Our text would accordingly have expressed the double thought. "He would have played the *escarbote* indeed, and discharged a *peditum*."

H. Loss

Carleton College

PROVENÇAL *huelh de veire* AND *sec . . . son agre*

There is a brief Provençal bestiary, known as "Aiso son las naturas d'alcus auzels e d'alcunas bestias," which is available in both the Appel and Bartsch-Koschwitz chrestomathies.¹ Among the birds is the *huelh de veire* or 'bird that sees as through glass' whose marvellous power provokes many a laugh at the naivety of the medieval mind. This is the description: "Huelh de veire es un petitet auzel blanc e vert, et a la pus sotil vista que res que sia, que be veiria tras un paret." The bird in question must be the wood warbler (or wood wren) for which the French name today is *pouillot siffleur*.² This bird is very small, only five and a quarter inches long; it is greenish on the back and white with some yellow underneath. It "frequents high trees," then "hovers to pick food from under leaves, then back to perch."³ It is my belief that this habit of hovering over a leaf and seeming to perceive insects underneath gave rise to the belief that it could see through solid material. If this be true our laugh should not be quite so loud next time.

¹ Pp. 201-4 in Appel; cols. 359-64 in the Bartsch-Koschwitz.

² Paul Paris, *Les oiseaux d'Europe* (Paris: Laveur, 1906), p. 57. This is the *Phyllopneuste sibilatrix* or *Phylloscopus* of scientific terminology.

³ I am quoting from E. Sandars, *Bird Book* (Oxford Press, 1933), p. 26.

In this same bestiary is the *colom* or 'dove,' which *sec trop volunter son agre per paor d'auzel de cassa*.⁴ Appel suggests reading *set* (= *sez*) *t. v. sobre aiga* but with a question mark. However, it is quite true that the European rock dove "never lights on trees. Drinks freely, sometimes alighting on water,"⁵ and in this practice it is somewhat unique among others of its kind. I see no reason, therefore, for Appel's question mark.

URBAN T. HOLMES

University of North Carolina

FRENCH AND ENGLISH ECHOES OF A DESCRIPTIVE PASSAGE IN TASSO

In the *Gerusalemme liberata*, xv, 55-66, two warriors, searching for Rinaldo in the garden of Armida, come upon a fountain in whose waters some sirens are refreshing themselves. Tasso depicts the nakedness of the swimmers in the true style of the *Renascimento* and adds "E'l lago all'altre membra era un bel velo." He describes the eyes of one of the bathers and pictures her hair as "raccolto in un sol nodo" (61). When she leaves the water, she is worthy of comparison with a goddess:

. . . o come fuore
Spunto nascendo già dalle feconde
Spume dell'Ocean la Dea d'Amore.

La Calprenède reproduces a similar situation and scene in his *Faramond*, v, 86-88. A warrior chances to interrupt a beautiful maiden who is bathing in the Main. After noting carefully the qualities of her beauty, the novelist adds, "C'estoit tout ce qui me paroissoit alors, les eaux envieuses me cachotent le reste." He describes her eyes. Her hair is partially tied up with "une petite coiffe de gaze." La Calprenède then concludes with the same reference: "un pied bien plus beau que celuy qu'Homere donne à Thetis." Nathaniel Lee, drawing the material for his *Theodosius or the Force of Love* from the translation of *Faramond* by J.

⁴ This is found only in the version published by Appel; it is not in the Bartsch-Koschwitz. Appel's query is in the note.

⁵ Sandars, *ibid.*, p. 222; Paul Paris, *ibid.*, p. 77. This is the Columba Livia.

mindedness. "Never," says Gillot, "would the Pope have dared to take his (Plumus's) clerkly privileges away from him, for Plumus would have said "Esterc!" to him, and thus surely have played the *escarbote*." The *escarbotes* could appropriately make "Esterc!" their battle-cry. And Plumus, after uttering this horrific Rabelaisian challenge, "would in truth have shown himself an *escarbote*."

The article by Professor Holmes in the January number of *MLN*, on Villon's verse, "Plus enflée qu'un vlimeux escharbot," makes it possible to specify what Plumus's action would have been. The characteristic explosive discharge by the *escarbote*, or bombardier beetle, would lend to *faire l'escarbote* the additional sense of *pedere*. Our text would accordingly have expressed the double thought. "He would have played the *escarbote* indeed, and discharged a *peditum*."

H. LOSS

Carleton College

PROVENÇAL *huelh de veire* AND *sec . . . son agre*

There is a brief Provençal bestiary, known as "Aiso son las naturas d'alcus auzels e d'alcunas bestias," which is available in both the Appel and Bartsch-Koschwitz chrestomathies.¹ Among the birds is the *huelh de veire* or 'bird that sees as through glass' whose marvellous power provokes many a laugh at the naivety of the medieval mind. This is the description: "Huelh de veire es un petitet auzel blanc e vert, et a la pus sotil vista que res que sia, que be veiria tras un paret." The bird in question must be the wood warbler (or wood wren) for which the French name today is *pouillot siffleur*.² This bird is very small, only five and a quarter inches long; it is greenish on the back and white with some yellow underneath. It "frequents high trees," then "hovers to pick food from under leaves, then back to perch."³ It is my belief that this habit of hovering over a leaf and seeming to perceive insects underneath gave rise to the belief that it could see through solid material. If this be true our laugh should not be quite so loud next time.

¹ Pp. 201-4 in Appel; cols. 359-64 in the Bartsch-Koschwitz.

² Paul Paris, *Les oiseaux d'Europe* (Paris: Laveur, 1906), p. 57. This is the *Phyllopusneuste sibilatrix* or *Phylloscopus* of scientific terminology.

³ I am quoting from E. Sandars, *Bird Book* (Oxford Press, 1933), p. 26.

In this same bestiary is the *colom* or 'dove,' which *sec trop volunter son agre per paor d'auzel de cassa*.⁴ Appel suggests reading *set* (= *sez*) *t. v. sobre aiga* but with a question mark. However, it is quite true that the European rock dove "never lights on trees. Drinks freely, sometimes alighting on water,"⁵ and in this practice it is somewhat unique among others of its kind. I see no reason, therefore, for Appel's question mark.

URBAN T. HOLMES

University of North Carolina

FRENCH AND ENGLISH ECHOES OF A DESCRIPTIVE PASSAGE IN TASSO

In the *Gerusalemme liberata*, xv, 55-66, two warriors, searching for Rinaldo in the garden of Armida, come upon a fountain in whose waters some sirens are refreshing themselves. Tasso depicts the nakedness of the swimmers in the true style of the *Renascimento* and adds "E'l lago all'altre membra era un bel velo." He describes the eyes of one of the bathers and pictures her hair as "raccolto in un sol nodo" (61). When she leaves the water, she is worthy of comparison with a goddess:

. . . o come fuore
Spunto nascendo già dalle feconde
Spume dell'Ocean la Dea d'Amore.

La Calprenède reproduces a similar situation and scene in his *Faramond*, v, 86-88. A warrior chances to interrupt a beautiful maiden who is bathing in the Main. After noting carefully the qualities of her beauty, the novelist adds, "C'estoit tout ce qui me paroissoit alors, les eaux envieuses me cachotent le reste." He describes her eyes. Her hair is partially tied up with "une petite coiffe de gaze." La Calprenède then concludes with the same reference: "un pied bien plus beau que celui qu'Homere donne à Thetis." Nathaniel Lee, drawing the material for his *Theodosius or the Force of Love* from the translation of *Faramond* by J.

⁴ This is found only in the version published by Appel; it is not in the Bartsch-Koschwitz. Appel's query is in the note.

⁵ Sandars, *ibid.*, p. 222; Paul Paris, *ibid.*, p. 77. This is the Columba Livia.

Phillips, includes an almost identical scene in Act I, ll. 171-210, where Theodosius describes to Atticus the circumstances surrounding his seeing Athenaïs for the first time.¹ The Emperor, by chance, passes a stream where he hears two charming voices. He comes upon a woman who is bathing. Like Tasso and La Calprenède, Lee depicts her "naked glory" and yet remains within the bounds of absolute propriety by adding that "down to her knees, the nymph was wrapped in lawn" (l. 197). Her beauty calls for comparison with the Goddess of Love:

Not sea-born Venus, in the courts beneath,
When the green nymphs first kis'd her coral lips,
All polisht, fair and washed with Orient beauty,
Could in my dazling fancy match her brightness (ll. 185-8).

SPIRE PITOU, JR.

Georgia School of Technology

NOTE ON A LETTER BY FONTENELLE

Sometime before 1712¹ Fontenelle wrote a long letter "sur la resurrection" to the Marquis de La Fare. This letter has never been printed in the works of Fontenelle and although it has had two separate editions,² there is but one known copy of them in

¹ Fritz Resa, *Nathaniel Lees Trauerspiel Theodosius*, Berlin, Felber, 1904, points out Lee's debt to that portion of the novel devoted to the story of Athenaïs, Theodosius, and Varanès, but he does not mention that this passage, taken from the story of Viridomare, is copied almost directly from *Faramond*. Thus, it can now be said with certainty that Lee was familiar with more of the novel than only those pages devoted to the Athenaïs-Theodosius-Varanès triangle. That the same passage in Tasso was subsequently used by Chateaubriand has already been pointed out by Gilbert Chinard, *Les Natchez de Chateaubriand*, Baltimore, The Johns Hopkins Press, 1932, p. 329. Cf. also Chandler Beall, *Chateaubriand et le Tasse*, *ibid.*, 1934, p. 56.

² The Marquis de La Fare, to whom the letter is addressed, died in 1712.

² (1) In 1807, 60 copies only, printed by Doctor Thomassin of Besançon on his private press, with a supplement. (2) According to Brunet (*Manuel*, II, col. 1333) this was reprinted, without the supplement, viz.: *En Europe*. 1819, pet. in -8 de 5 feuillets tirés à 50 exemplaires. Gabriel Peignot reprinted (1807, an edition of 94 copies only) the *Relation de l'Île de Bornéo*

existence.³ But there is a manuscript copy of the letter, made prior to 1758, at the Bibliothèque Nationale.⁴ This copy has some forty variants differing from the printed letter, and in all cases they are preferable, in lucidity and in grammar, to Thomassin's version. One or two of them seem to be worth calling attention to since they throw some light on Fontenelle's choice of reading-matter, as well as revealing the strange behavior of Dr. Thomassin in omitting them.

Near the end of Thomassin's edition we read: "*Le marquis de Roquelaure aura un nez, et Monseigneur le duc d'Estrées (sic) n'en aura qu'un.*" Jamet's copy reads: "*Là, M. de Roquelaure poura aller à la foire des nez s'en choisir un qui plaise aux femmes, et M. le duc d'Estrées n'en aura plus qu'un.*" This Roquelaure is doubtless Gaston-Jean-Baptiste (1614-1683), called "the homeliest man in France," and Estrée is probably Victor-Marie (1660-1737). As for the "foire des nez," that comes from Rabelais, Book I, ch. 40. At the end of the letter, Thomassin reads: "*Je m'informerai de leur⁵ sort au premier long entretien que j'aurai avec mon génie; mais . . .*" Jamet: "*Je m'informerai de leur sort au premier long entretien que j'aurai avec mon génie, frère de celui du comte de Gabalis; mais . . .*" *Le Comte de Gabalis* (Paris, 1670, in -12) is a book by Montfaucon de Villars and its second part is entitled: *les Génies assistants et les Gnômes irréconciliables*. It is a satirical, esoteric book that brought down the burning wrath of the Church upon its author.

The letter itself is of no great importance except to show excellently well the scientific-witty-benevolent nature of Fontenelle, his presaging the doctrines of the conservation of energy, and his ideas on a future life that coincide on some major points with those held by certain modern religious denominations.

The Principia College, Elsah, Illinois

ROBERT E. PIKE

by Fontenelle, to a few copies of which was appended the letter printed by Thomassin, but so far as I know all these copies have disappeared, as well as all of the edition of 1819. At least none are to be found in the libraries of Paris and London.

³ BN, Rés. D. 61606 (Thomassin's edition).

⁴ Nouv. acq. fr. 4364, pp. 26-29. This volume is a strange collection, written or compiled by the bibilophile F.-L. Jamet (1710-1768).

⁵ i. e., of women in the next world.

UNE SOURCE DU ZADIG DE VOLTAIRE

L'édition annotée de *Zadig* faite par les soins de M. G. Ascoli est excellente et ce n'est que le hasard des lectures qui me permet de suggérer la source d'un épisode mal expliqué de ce roman.

On se rappelle que *Zadig*¹ avait composé des vers impromptus sur une tablette et que l'ayant brisée en deux il en avait jeté les morceaux dans les buissons. Or l'Envieux en retrouva un seul dont les vers incomplets étaient une injure au roi. *Zadig* fut emprisonné.

Il est évident tout d'abord que Voltaire voulait montrer par là comment un écrivain innocent pouvait être injustement mis en prison à cause de ses écrits. Mais la chose en elle-même était trop commune pour ne pas croire que Voltaire ait songé à un cas historique précis. Au 17^e siècle les hommes brûlés pour leurs livres commençaient à se faire rares.² L'un des derniers, Claude Le Petit, auteur du *Paris Ridicule*, fut condamné au bûcher en 1662.³ Bien qu'on ne sache pas exactement de quelle manière il fut incriminé, il circulait sur sa condamnation une légende fort accréditée et souvent répétée.⁴ On racontait que le vent avait, par une fenêtre ouverte, emporté quelques brouillons des poésies de Le Petit et qu'ils étaient tombés sur un prêtre qui passait dans la rue. Celui-ci n'aurait eu rien de plus pressé que de dénoncer l'auteur à la censure. Notons la ressemblance des deux épisodes et surtout l'intervention d'un prêtre, la bête noire de Voltaire.

Voltaire connaissait-il cette légende? On peut le supposer car non seulement il connaissait bien le "siècle de Louis XIV," il devait encore porter un intérêt tout particulier aux hommes condamnés pour leurs écrits. Mais nous avons une indication plus précise qui rend presque certaine notre hypothèse que Voltaire, en écrivant le chapitre de l'Envieux, s'est servi de cet épisode. On sait quel intérêt il portait à Boileau. Or dans l'édition de ses œuvres de 1745 (*Zadig* est de 1747) le commentaire de quelques

¹ Chapitre IV, "L'Envieux."

² Voir Mac Pherson, H. D. *Censorship under Louis XIV*, New York. Inst. Fr. Stud. 1929, ch. II.

³ Voir *Les œuvres libertines de Claude Le Petit*, précédées d'une notice biographique par F. Lachèvre, 1918.

⁴ Elle est reproduite dans la plupart des éditions annotées de Boileau, (*Art poétique*, II, sur la fin) y compris celle des Grands Ecrivains éditée par A. C. Gidel, t. II, 332, n. 2.

vers de l'*Art poétique*⁵ rapporte précisément l'anecdote sur Claude Le Petit. C'est là que Voltaire a dû trouver son inspiration.⁶

E. VON DER MÜHLL

Princeton University

VIGNY'S "ÉLÉVATIONS"

The obviously idealistic character of most of Alfred de Vigny's poetry is the result of a deep conviction, often expressed, of the poet. An undated passage in the *Journal d'un poète* says: "l'impuissant Zoïle est porté dans l'azur par le poète créateur," and in the *Réflexions sur la vérité dans l'art* (1827) we read: "ce n'est qu'à la Religion, à la Philosophie, à la Poésie, qu'il appartient d'aller plus loin que la vie, au delà des temps jusqu'à l'éternité." The poet's feeling is perhaps best summarized by the word "élévation." This is applied to several prose passages in the *Journal*, from 1827 on. About 1829 Vigny planned a group of twelve poems to be called *Élévations*, few of which, however, were ever written. It is in a letter of 1838 that he formulated his theory most definitely: "J'ai nommé ces poèmes *Élévations* parce que tous doivent partir de la peinture d'une image toute terrestre pour s'élever à des vues d'une nature plus divine et laisser (autant que je le puis faire) l'âme qui me suivra dans les régions supérieures: la prendre sur terre et la déposer aux pieds de Dieu." In his collected poems the term "Élévation" is actually appended to the titles of only two pieces, and these by no means his best, *Les amants de Montmorency* and *Paris*. But it might very well be applied to many of his greatest poems, which exemplify finely the transition from a scene "toute terrestre" to "des vues d'une nature plus divine." Thus, in *Moïse*, we go from the description of the Holy Land and

⁵ Voici le passage en question:

Toutesfois n'allez pas, goguenard dangereux,
Faire Dieu le sujet d'un badinage affreux.
A la fin tous ces jeux que l'athéisme élève,
Conduisent tristement le plaisant à la Grève.

(II, vers 187-190)

⁶ M. H. C. Lancaster a eu la bonté de me signaler le fait que V. Sardou, dans *l'Affaire des Poisons* (1908), s'est aussi servi d'un incident pareil.

the host of Hebrews to Moses' plaint to Jehovah; in *La mort du loup*, from a vivid hunting scene to doctrines of stoical philosophy; in *Le Mont des Oliviers*, from the scene in the garden to Christ's appeal to God for mercy to mankind; in *La maison du berger*, from the lowly shepherd's hut to lofty considerations on the might of nature and on the majesty of human suffering; in *les Destinées*, from the picture of man a hopeless slave of fate to a prayer for man's freedom; in *La bouteille à la mer*, from the wreck of a ship to the hymn of triumphant thought; in *L'esprit pur*, from an account of Vigny's ancestors to the reign of "pur esprit, roi du monde." These poems are, in truth, "Élévations," and remind us of Abbé Bremond's conclusion: "Les arts aspirent tous à rejoindre la prière."

GEO. N. HENNING

The George Washington University

REVIEWS

Atlante linguistico-etnografico italiano della Corsica promosso dalla R. Università di Cagliari, Introduzione. Par GINO BOTTIGLIONI, Pise: S. T. I. D., 1935. Pp. 230.

Les Raisons et les principaux caractères de l' "Atlante linguistico-etnografico italiano della Corsica" (A L E I C). Par GINO BOTTIGLIONI, Pise: 1936. Pp. 84, 3 cartes-spécimen et une planche de Guido Colucci.

Le critique qui lit l'introduction à l'Atlas corse destiné à remplacer l'Atl. lingu. de la Corse de Gilliéron et Edmont (dont seulement 2 volumes, et de valeur douteuse, ont apparu), doit éprouver une joie singulière en voyant réaliser des principes qu'il avait défendus depuis des années vis-à-vis d'orthodoxes adhérents de l'école de géographie linguistique et particulièrement leur maître, le génial et violent Gilliéron. Cette joie n'est pas tempérée, mais au contraire augmentée par le fait que l'auteur italien de l'Atlas corse ne semble pas avoir connu ces critiques, que je me permets d'énumérer pour mémoire: "Die Sprachgeographie," *Bull. de dialectologie romane* 1913; critique de l'Atlas linguistique de Catalogne, *ZRPh.* XLVI [1925], 614; critique de Sever Pop, "Buts et méthodes des enquêtes dialectales," *Literaturbl. f. germ. u. rom.*

Phil. 1928, col. 189; "Dictionnaires ou atlas linguistiques?"; *Revue internationale des études basques* 1929. L' "Introduction" de M. Bottiglioni à l'Atlas corse (A L E I C), dont cinq volumes ont paru (qui me sont restés inaccessibles) et qui complète l' A I S (Atlas ital.-suisse compilé par Jaberg-Jud), est une œuvre de méthodologie comparables à celles d'auteurs d'autres atlas, comme Jaberg-Jud, Scheuermeier, S. Pop, et on peut ainsi mesurer le chemin parcouru par la géographie linguistique depuis les premières tentatives de ce genre, les atlas de Weigand et de Gilliéron.

M. B. combat la prétendue nécessité de ne fixer sur les cartes que la réaction spontanée et de premier jet d'un seul sujet questionné par un seul explorateur, nécessité garantissant seule, nous disait-on, l'objectivité du relevé et la comparabilité des matériaux. L' A I S s'en tenait encore au postulat impérieux de Gilliéron. M. B. renonce au sujet unique et il reproche spirituellement à M. Scheuermeier d'avoir synthétisé les réponses divergentes d'un seul sujet en une forme-type—pourquoi alors ne pas synthétiser en une forme-type les formes données par plusieurs individus parlants de la même localité? M. B. renonce de même à l'explorateur unique parcourant à la hâte des régions différentes dont il ne connaît pas toujours le parler particulier, en faveur de connaisseurs (à noter le pluriel!) intimes du parler enquêté, qui synthétiseraient leurs observations: "importa di sapere non come ha parlato il tale individuo in un certo momento, ma come si parla in un determinato paese." La conception de l'atlas-instantané est donc abandonnée. Des études préalables des conditions historiques, ethnographiques, géographiques et linguistiques des localités devront toujours précéder le relevé lui-même (les discordances de notre Atlas avec l'Atlas corse de Gilliéron au point de vue du choix des localités se sont révélées minimes, ce que notre auteur explique par le peu de densité de la population sur cette île, de sorte que n'importe quel explorateur aurait dû choisir les mêmes localités). Quant au questionnaire, notre auteur se distingue de ses prédécesseurs par l'introduction de phrases laissées en suspens que le sujet devait compléter—c'est d'ailleurs le système des grammaires françaises à l'usage d'enfants français—(p. ex. *è amaro come . . .* [il fiele, il toscò]); par l'adaptation préalable du questionnaire aux conditions ethniques et linguistiques de la région (ce principe, pas toujours réalisé, a pourtant été l'idéal d' à peu près tous les enquêteurs "post-gilliéroniens"); par l'insistance sur ce point capital que "il questionario deve rappresentare non il mezzo ma il fine dell' inchiesta," d'où dérive une certaine liberté des moyens employés pour provoquer des équivalences dialectales comparables entre elles: il ne s'agit pas p. ex. de fixer les réactions des sujets sur une même gravure, mais d'arriver, par les moyens les plus différents, à la vraie équivalence lexicographique; par l'inclusion de phrases seulement (innovation particulière: les proverbes si nom-

breux) et l'exclusion des mots détachés;¹ et par la collaboration d'un groupe de patoisants avec le sujet principal, qui se sentait quelquefois encouragé et qui était aussi quelquefois corrigé par l'assistance. Ce qui distingue encore M. B., c'est le ralentissement du voyage d'exploration et une sorte de vie en commun pendant une semaine avec les sujets d'un lieu; la traduction des en-têtes, de phrases sur les cartes en français, en anglais et en allemand (je dois dire que je ne vois pas la nécessité absolue de ce polyglottisme de wagon-restaurant—passe encore, pour la Corse, la traduction en français, langue administrative du pays; mais quel savant étudiant l'Atlas corse aura besoin de l'anglais et de l'allemand, pour connaître le sens exact des phrases? d'ailleurs l'allemand, de ces en-têtes, même dans la forme corrigée à la p. 219, n'est pas exempt de fautes: on ne dit pas *Ehevermittler*, mais *Heiratsvermittler*; *das Bräutigamanzug* est grotesque; je ne comprends pas *Fuss pann*; *er lief Hals über Kopf* est correct etc.); des indications de géographie physique (fleuves, montagnes) au lieu de la nudité abstraite de cartes purement linguistiques.

Les innovations introduites par M. B. (à l'exception des quelques points de moindre importance relevés plus haut) sont inspirées par le bon sens et la sagesse même. Voilà qu'enfin le sortilège que Gilliéron, par son prestige de thaumaturge, a fait peser sur la cartographie linguistique, est rompu et que les saines suggestions de tout homme non prévenu prévalent! Enfin un spécialiste d'exploration linguistique-géographique qui abonde dans le sens de ceux qui ne pouvaient appuyer leurs critiques sur une expérience pratique de relevés dialectologiques! On reconnaît, après une trentaine d'années de hantise par un simulacre de précision, d'objectivité soi-disant scientifique, combien cette préocupa-

¹ L'auteur n'exagère-t-il pas ici une réaction d'ailleurs salutaire contre des excès contraires?—le mot détaché a pourtant, quoi qu'il dise, une existence à lui, car tout homme parlant a reçu le don d'observer et d'analyser son langage: il y a une sorte de "Rededeixis" primitive; tout parlant naïf ne dira-t-il pas: "Je connais, je ne connais pas ce mot," ce qui prouve l'existence de la notion du mot dans son esprit?—ce qu'il faudrait dire, c'est qu'il y a des formes *syntactiques* et des formes *in pausa* des mêmes mots et que certains mots sont plus fréquents, soit sous l'une soit sous l'autre forme: il est évident que p. ex. des noms propres, figurant volontiers dans des réponses, auront des formes *in pausa*; le contraire se réalisera pour des pronoms conjoints, la copule verbale, etc; la forme de mots détachés aura donc toujours son intérêt, même si le fait de détacher un mot altère le caractère habituel du mot: l'emphase est une forme du langage, donc la forme emphatique a sa place dans la langue: les formes accentuées de l'article anglais *the* [ði] et français [lə] ont droit d'entrée au même titre que les formes habituelles [ðe] et [l].—De la confiance que l'explorateur a dans la véracité et le talent linguistique de patoisants régionaux intelligents, qui peuvent acquérir l'exactitude de vrais linguistes, s'ensuit l'association de linguistes 'populaires' à son travail d'enquête: ("fra la sua percezione [sc. d'un linguista straniero] e quella dell' indigeno foneticamente addestrato, non esiterei a preferire la seconda.")

tion de réduire l'explorateur et son sujet à la machine ou à l'appareil enregistreur a faussé le rendement des atlas: sans l'intervention de Gilliéron, on aurait conclu que la connaissance préalable du dialecte qu'on étudie, la collaboration d'indigènes doués pour l'observation linguistique, la nécessité de retouches aux matériaux faits sur place si l'enquêteur a reconnu la fausseté de certains de ses relevés, la pluralité des observateurs et des observés se contrôlant mutuellement, une sorte de vie familière ensemble avec les sujets devraient influer utilement sur la qualité de la récolte: non, le pseudo-naturalisme, le *would-be-objectivisme* et l'idée de l'homme-machine dans le programme gilliéronien ont fait retarder l'horloge du progrès.² Gilliéron aimait écarter ces objections, en déplaçant habilement la question 'de droit' sur le domaine de la question de 'fait': Voyez pourtant l'œuvre qu'Edmont a su parfaire. . . . Mais l'Atlas corse d'Edmont, c'est-à-dire cet empiètement en somme grotesque d'un explorateur français habitué à manier des patois français, sur un dialecte italien qu'il ne connaissait pas suffisamment, a rendu justice de cette notion de l'homme-appareil pouvant tout enregistrer.

Je me réjouis de lire à la p. 177, au sujet d'un rédacteur de journal à Vénaco, M. Notini, qui a traduit par écrit dans son patois local le questionnaire, les lignes suivantes de M. B.: "Come si vede, siamo ben lungi dal metodo che comunemente si prescrive per la raccolta dagli atlanti linguistici: nessun interrogatorio diretto, nessuna esibizione di figure, nessun rigido meccanismo di preordinate domande, niente paura dell' autosuggestione."³ Saremmo al deprecato metodo di raccolta per corrispon-

² Combien la tradition gilliéronienne pèse encore sur ses élèves même les plus émancipés, on le voit par le fait que MM. Jaberg et Jud dans leur AIS ne se sont pas départis entièrement de la phobie de leur maître d'enregistrer les parlers des villes, soi-disant impurs; on sait que Paris, le centre d'irradiation linguistique le plus puissant de France, comme l'a précisément montré Gilliéron, ne figure pas sur l' A L F (qui montre donc les influences d'un facteur de premier ordre 'invisible et présent')—l' AIS, timide encore, n'enregistre que deux spécimens de parlers de villes aussi importantes que Florence, Venise, Milan—et Rome, qui est un amoncellement de petites villes et dont le quartier Trastevere mériterait un relevé *up to date*? On remarquera l'aveu de M. Jaberg, dans une étude basée sur l' AIS du mot *capo*, que l'auteur avoue incomplète ("Aspects géographiques du langage" p. 58) ". . . que sur la plupart des cartes en question les centres italiens ne sont pas représentés," et la résipiscence de la note 2 de la p. 82.

³ Voir aussi ce que dit M. B. à la page 140 contre ce prétendu danger d'un enquêteur d'un parler qui serait un spécialiste de ce parler: "nella percezione e trascrizione dei suoni e delle forme che egli vien raccogliendo, deve necessariamente riferirsi a una lingua a lui familiare che lo suggestiona non meno di quella che avesse per avventura studiata prima, nella sua zona d'inchiesta." J'ajouterai encore une remarque: plus le spécialiste d'un parler est préparé à entendre une certaine variété de parler, plus il sera sensible aux nuances. Toute notation d'un mot suppose qu'on le reconnaisse—donc il faut en avoir une connaissance préalable: j'admire

denza, che io non condannerei affatto, se tutti i corrispondenti avessero l'intelligenza, il vivo interesse, la capacità generica e specifica del N." J'applaudis des deux mains, puisque j'ai, à diverses reprises, dit la même chose.

Qu'une observation critique me soit permise: l'auteur qui dans le chapitre "Il raccoglitore" se déclare convaincu de l'opinion de Bruneau: "L'enquêteur est réduit au rôle d'une machine," pourquoi ne nous dit-il pas (d'ailleurs pas plus que ses prédécesseurs) ce par quoi il se distingue d'une machine, en d'autres termes, pourquoi ne nous parle-t-il pas de sa propre personnalité? Je trouve cette réserve au point de vue de la propre biographie peu à sa place (Schuchardt ne la partageait pas): car comment pourrions-nous faire le départ entre les matériaux en soi et leur déformation nécessaire par l' "équation personnelle" de l'explorateur? Pourquoi tous ces enquêteurs de parlers ne nous disent-ils pas en toute sincérité: je suis de tempérament cholérique, phlegmatique etc.; je suis plutôt du type auditif que visuel (ou le contraire), j'ai la réaction prompte ou lente; j'ai l'oreille plus affinée que l'entendement (ce qui peut arriver,—ou le contraire); mon intérêt est plutôt porté vers la phonétique ou vers la sémantique; je devine (ou non) un son très facilement par la mimique; je me fatigue vite ou lentement; j'ai (ou n'ai pas) le tempérament artistique etc.? Comme les atlas sont nécessairement moins des fixations du parler en soi que du dialogue entre un A enquêteur et un B enquêté, pourquoi dissimuler l'un des partenaires? Si l'enquêteur n'est pas capable d'une auto-analyse sincère ou ne se sent pas en humeur introspective, pourquoi n'en charge-t-il pas un confrère, linguiste ou psychologue? Si un psychologue perspicace avait pu mettre un portrait exact de la personnalité d'Edmont (et peut-être aussi de Gilliéron) à la tête de l' A L F, on ne se serait pas si étrangement mépris sur l'œuvre! On nous dira qu'il n'est pas usuel de mettre la biographie de l'auteur dans l'œuvre de science ou d'art—

toujours la dextérité de ces enquêteurs étrangers qui notent des mots qu'ils n'ont jamais entendus. Moi, personnellement, j'ai des difficultés à reconnaître sous la prononciation américaine le nom de tel auteur allemand qui m'est familier depuis des années et même des mots courants anglais que je connais bien—et un Edmont de St. Pol en Picardie a voulu noter le corse! On me dira: vous n'avez pas l'oreille d'Edmont. Entendu—mais est-ce qu'Edmont savait l'italien comme je sais l'anglais?

"M. B. nous dit, avec une gravité touchante: "ho fatto del mio meglio per avvicinar mi all' ideale del perfetto raccoglitore"—mais pourquoi ce nouveau Démosthène ne nous fait-il pas savoir l'écart entre ce qu'il était et ce qu'il est devenu à la suite de cet entraînement énergétique?

Combien je suis à l'aise en lisant sur l'avant-dernière page de notre volume des aveux inconscients comme ceux-ci: "La Corsica, l'isola bellissima, io l'ho percorsa a palmo a palmo, ma non l'ho goduta," "la dolce parlata di Dante e dei Trecentisti mi suonava all' orecchio, e questa musica era per me più dolce dell' armonia del paesaggio corso." Je suis renseigné maintenant sur la sensibilité particulière de M. Bottiglioni—qui pourtant a ajouté un admirable album de vues et de types d'hommes corses à notre volume.

oui, mais parce que la personnalité de l'auteur s'exprime dans l'œuvre même, alors que les données soi-disant objectives des atlas nous font faire fausse-route. Je crois même que, plus on abandonnera le postulat de l'homme-machine, plus on regardera en face la subjectivité inhérente à toute enquête dialoguée, plus on aura de chance d'atteindre l'objectivité voulue. L'homme de science le sera véritablement, non pas s'il se diminue ou se rétrécit artificiellement, mais s'il n'abdique rien de ce qui est humain en lui. Le maximum d'humanité garantit le maximum de science.⁵

LEO SPITZER

The Johns Hopkins University

A History of French Dramatic Literature in the Seventeenth Century, Part III, The Period of Molière, 1652-1672. In Two Volumes. By HENRY CARRINGTON LANCASTER. Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins Press, 1936. Pp. 896. Price \$10.00.

Le présent reviewer a décrit ici-même les deux premières parties de cette œuvre monumentale. Elle s'achevaient sur la conclusion que sans les productions des années 1635-1651, période où culmine Corneille, ni Molière ni Racine n'auraient été ce qu'ils furent.

C'est sous le signe de Molière que Lancaster place la présente et troisième partie de son étude. Et le buste de Racine est déjà fortement engagé dans la glaise que l'historien manie de ses puissantes et patientes mains. Les bas-reliefs, les frises et les chapiteaux, grouillants de vie mais clairement ordonnés, sont représentés par la description du fait social, technique, professionnel et par l'étude détaillée des productions. Ces productions sont nombreuses et le reviewer qui ne veut point être un résumeur n'ira pas se perdre dans les 301 pièces où L. se retrouve. Il dira simplement ce qui émerge dans son esprit une fois ces 900 pages lues.

C'est d'abord l'étroite et précoce liaison du fait politique, du fait Louis XIV, si on peut dire, avec le fait dramatique. C'est aussi l'*Hédonisme*, l'orientation vers le plaisir du public qui empreint les plus austères faiseurs de codes dramatiques. C'est le caractère complaisant, minutieux des recettes et des directives d'un d'Aubi-

⁵ Je me demande si la préoccupation de M. B. de ne poser que des questions en italien à ses sujets n'a pas dû un peu altérer—dans un sens contraire à la francisation edmontienne du corse—l'état actuel du dialecte, vu que, par l'école, le service militaire et l'administration, le français est assez répandu en corse. En somme, nous ne sommes pas, autant que je puisse voir, renseignés sur l'intensité du bilinguisme corse. Il aurait été intéressant de relever aussi le français de Corse (corse francisé ou français corsisé).

gnac dont la *Pratique du théâtre* est ici condensée (pp. 9-13). C'est dans le Corneille des *Discours* le même *Hédonisme* avec un plus grand esprit de liberté. C'est l'extraordinaire *interplay* de l'imitation et de l'invention qui, à propos d'un acte sans titre permet à L. de pénétrer dans le laboratoire dramatique de Scarron et de Molière, car, pour la fusion du métal étranger, la forge est la même. C'est à propos de Corneille le merveilleux esprit de renouvellement de ce vieux qui, loin de tourner en rond dans sa gloire et son passé, fut, dit L., un esprit "ahead of his times," un esprit plus inquiet que Racine le fut jamais de voir la tragédie se stéréotyper. Sans doute le Vieux songeait avant tout à soi, mais cela n'empêche qu'il y eût chez lui, dans ses *Discours*, dans ses expériences un besoin d'action, de propagande, si on peut dire, un altruisme intellectuel qui ne se retrouve pas chez Racine.

C'est enfin, c'est surtout la leçon de complétude, de vision concrète qui ressort de toutes les pages de L. On me permettra d'en marquer l'importance à propos de la question de l'Esprit classique: L. écrit (498) au sujet des *Machine-Plays*, de leur importance, de leur succès et de la façon dont Corneille et Molière mêmes les ont pratiquées, que ce phénomène doit être accepté, "however inconvenient it may appear to those critics who explain glibly the true meaning of *classicism*." Il y a dans cette observation de L. quelque chose qui tout ensemble rafraîchit et effraie. On peut en dire autant d'un autre coup de griffe que voici: "The Classical Age is thoroughly classical only to those who, through ignorance or prejudice, refuse to consider more than a portion of the facts." En fait la complétude cartésienne des revues et des dénombrements auxquels se livre L. s'oppose à ce qu'on admette les formules globales, les théories brillamment rigides sur le Classicisme. Prenons par exemple (et ici je voudrais pousser plus loin que lui la pensée de L.) cette idée assez convenue que le Stoïcisme était une sorte d'ambiance des âmes et des esprits de l'âge classique. Pour le croire on se base entre autres choses sur le succès de l'Idéalisme cornélien. Mais si on lit ce que L. nous dit sur Corneille, on voit encore et toujours chez celui-ci le souci de trouver, si on ose dire, les grands "trucs." Or pour lui le conflit entre devoir et nature, devoir et passion est un de ces "trucs" tout simplement. C'est un "ressort," un outil d'intérêt dramatique. Or qui dit "ressort" dit surprise. Si la subjugation de la passion par le devoir eût été cette norme vivante, cette habitude qu'on voudrait nous faire croire, s'il n'y avait pas eu là paradoxe, renversement de valeurs, il n'y eut pas eu un coup frappé, un ressort détendu. La même réflexion vient aussi à l'esprit à propos du roman cornélien qui s'appelle la *Princesse de Clèves*.

Même sujet de méditation en ce qui concerne le prétendu Idéalisme (non plus moral mais intellectuel et descriptif) de l'époque classique. Car le Réalisme de la Comédie, aux environs

de 1660, tel qu'il ressort des titres, des thèmes, des analyses, des citations fournis par L., est chose qui étonne. En effet il s'agit ici d'un Réalisme au second degré, minutieux, touche-à-tout, terre à terre, d'un détaillisme, si on peut dire, dont on ne peut se faire une idée juste si on ne sait rien des Gillet, Chappuzeau,¹ Villiers, Dorimond, Boucher, Chevalier, La Forge, Brécourt, Françoise Pascal, Champmeslé, Hauteroche, Montfleury fils, Visé et autres. Ces écrivains oubliés devraient être exploités avec les gazetiers, les mémorialistes et les épistoliers pour l'histoire de la société au XVII^e siècle. Voici jetés en vrac des exemples de ce qu'on trouve chez eux : Paris, ses quartiers, ses rues avec les cris et les métiers ; les logeurs de garnis ; les taverniers et les buveurs ; les cuisiniers et les gastronomes ; une *Rôtisserie* ; des *Ramoneurs* ; les *Carosses à cinq sous* ; les portiers et les affichistes de théâtre ; les *Intrigues de la loterie* ; les tireurs et tricheurs de cartes ; les grisettes ; les bouquetières ; les abbés galants et les chevaliers d'industrie ; les maquignons ; des paysans, des provinciaux ; des étrangers (voire des Russes) de tout poil et de tout dialecte. Ce réalisme au second degré paraît une sorte d'avancée vers le théâtre de la Foire et vers le XVIII^e siècle. Mais un fait remarquable c'est que ces auteurs si familiers, si libres s'en tiennent à une technique classique "in the main" (46), ne violant guère en fait de règles que celles des bienséances.

Quant aux hardiesses d'idées elles sont rares : On n'en trouve guère que chez Cyrano et Hauteroche. Mais le *Colbert enragé* récemment édité par G. van Roosbroeck est d'une franche audace politique.² La langue de ces pièces est, à en juger par les nombreuses citations de Lancaster, fort intéressante. Elle a un ton parlé, vif et chaud, qui rappelle celui de certaines farces du XV^e siècle. D'autre part, le tour et l'humour d'un Scarron sentent les ruses et les gaietés verbales de Hugo et de Rostand. Beaucoup de ces auteurs étaient des acteurs comme Molière (qui, directeur de troupe, n'était pas payé comme tel mais recevait double part comme acteur et comme auteur).

Le Molière de L. est remarquable par la fermeté du crayon biographique. Fermeté qui va jusqu'à la sècheresse voulue, bien qu'on sente dans sa concision même une fougue de justice et d'admiration pour son modèle. Peut-être par réaction contre les faux coloristes L. refuse-t-il certaines nuances et certaines ombres qui pourtant seraient justes. Ainsi une ombre d'amertume ; ainsi une nuance de subjectivisme. Mais on approuvera pleinement ce qu'il dit sur l'activité et les buts de Molière. Il souligne avec vigueur

¹ Une *Physionomie* qui est par ailleurs comme cosmopolite d'un intérêt très marqué. Il fut le premier Français à mettre en Chine l'action d'une pièce, *Armetzar*, 1650.

² Le même Van R. a soulevé au sujet du *Trasibule* de Montfleury et du *Hamlet* de Shakespeare un important débat qui ne me semble pas fermé malgré les conclusions de L. (pp. 551-4).

que Molière ne fut pas un réformateur, mais un homme de théâtre encore et toujours. Il fut occupé avant tout de *plaire*, comme le fut Corneille à l'autre bout du champ des émotions. Il cherchait des sujets; il voyait la société, l'humanité comme un trésor de sujets et non comme un objet de morale. Cette immense Sagesse toute simple qui fait sa morale il ne l'inspire que parce qu'il la respire—presque sans le savoir.

Pour l'œuvre de Molière en ses sources et sa technique l'étude que nous en donne L. est nettement *centrée*, se distingue par la précision avec laquelle l'œuvre est *située*. Ici l'historien était admirablement servi par la minutieuse enquête qu'il avait fait porter sur tout le domaine dramatique depuis 1610. Voici très en gros ce qu'il voit: Il est aisé de trouver ce qui a influencé Molière; il est impossible de trouver ce qui l'a, si on peut dire, originé. Lanson pour ce dernier point répondait: la Farce. Mais L., bien qu'il constate le regain vigoureux de la Farce à l'époque de Molière, en ramène l'influence à des proportions modestes. Il pense que le précoce éclectisme des goûts et des emprunts de Molière s'oppose à toute idée unitaire de la genèse de son œuvre. Molière est un génie de fusion composite. Ses sources sont extrêmement éparpillées dans tout le domaine latin depuis Plaute jusqu'à Chappuzeau. Il prend de toute main, surtout des mots de théâtre, des *gags* et des situations. Il transforme le plus souvent ce qu'il emprunte mais pressé il lui arrive de transplanter tout vif. Il a aussi emprunté de larges faits de technique, par exemple à Corneille une "révolution" dramatique dont L. souligne l'importance pour la présentation des événements (247-248). Plus on sait, comme L., de choses sur Molière et plus on le voit emprunteur et pourtant riche de soi-même. Si on pouvait résoudre cette antinomie, on aurait la clef du problème du Génie, c'est-à-dire de l'Individualité. En ce qui concerne Molière nous sentons confusément que son propre, ce par quoi il est lui-même et ce qui de lui demeure c'est cette gaieté folle en marche vers la Sagesse (*Le Bourgeois . . .*; le *Malade . . .*), et d'autre part cette profondeur un peu triste (oui, même si point romantique) qu'il apporte à décrire des personnages qui manquent à la Sagesse ou à la Nature (*l'Avare*, *Tartuffe*, le *Misanthrope*). Les personnages en question pouvaient être déjà dans les livres ou sur les planches, mais leur essence moliéresque ne vient pas de là. Pour ses constructions—là on pourrait retirer les briques d'emprunt sans que le bâtiment, sans que les bonshommes s'écroulent. L'extrême difficulté de saisir au juste chez Molière l'*interplay* des influences avec l'observation individuelle est très sensible à propos de *Tartuffe*. Chaque situation, presque chaque élément de cette œuvre se retrouve quelque part avant Molière et le personnage lui-même a plusieurs ancêtres et cousins (624 *et seq.*). Et cependant Tartuffe s'est rencontré probablement dans la ligne de vision de Molière comme un personnage de chair et d'os, non de papier, quelqu'un enfin que Molière a non pas lu mais connu, coudoyé.

La triste essence de ce faux-bonhomme n'est pas contenue dans l'alambic où on peut distiller les influences de Sorel, d'Audiguier, Scarron, Salas Barbadillo, etc.

Pour Alceste l'analyse que L. en donne (657-659) est, franchement, la meilleure que je connaisse. Il s'agit surtout ici d'apprécier le degré de comique du personnage, car c'est au fond à ce problème que se ramène toute analyse du caractère d'Alceste. L. souligne aussi l'allure non point largement sociale mais *mondaine* de l'observation de Molière dans cette pièce. A propos d'Alceste encore L. fait observer quelque part (je cite de mémoire) qu'il doit préférer au sujet de ce caractère certaines conclusions qui ne procèdent pourtant point de la méthode que lui, L., préfère. Je m'emparerai de cet aveu plein de probité libre pour apprécier cette méthode. C'est une grande et belle méthode mais essentiellement descriptive. Les relevés et les analyses, les dénombrements cartésiens de tous les faits contrôlables y servent à des synthèses où les faits et les chiffres se retrouvent encore et qui tracent des courbes, figurent un mouvement (mouvement descendant de la tragi-comédie, brièvement ascendant de la pastorale; montée des *Machine-Plays* et des comédies-ballets; élan repris par la tragédie avec le vieux Corneille; ascendant marqué de la comédie). Il est remarquable de voir comment la portion critique, appréciation esthétique, de l'œuvre de L. demeure encore et toujours historique. Grâce à son incomparable et constante confrontation des pièces avec les codes L. réduit au minimum la part de son équation personnelle, subjective. Il décrit: il ne décrète point. Historien encore et toujours il a horreur de l'anachronisme. C'est pourquoi il se garde (un peu trop à mon avis) des rapprochements avec le futur et l'actuel et se garde aussi de voir les faits du passé sous l'angle de tendances métaphysiques, sociologiques, psychologiques modernes. Si, dans ce refus, il y a consentement à certaines limites, ces limites sont conscientes, voulues. Mais qu'importe après tout (sauf pour des spéculatifs chimériques de mon espèce) ces problèmes de tendances, de courants critiques? Ce qui importe c'est le résultat. Or le résultat c'est l'œuvre la plus belle d'utilité tangible qu'on nous ait jamais donnée sur le sujet.

LOUIS CONS

Columbia University

Albums poétiques de Marguerite d'Autriche. Par MARCEL FRANCON. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press. Paris: Droz, 1934. Pp. 300.

La Période, la Personnalité-centre, le Groupe ici présentés offrent un intérêt certain. La Période est, pour l'incubation des œuvres, l'extrême fin du moyen-âge et, pour la mise au jour, la seconde décade du XVI^e siècle. Période-charnière et frontière.

La Personnalité est celle de l'inspiratrice des Albums. C'est cette Marguerite d'Autriche dont la figure a été récemment éclairée par Max Bruchet, A. Chagny et F. Girard, J. Jacquemain, Ghisèle de Bloom et M. F. lui-même. Sur les goûts, la lecture et la culture de Marguerite il nous donne (pp. 23-28) une esquisse courte mais précise et pleine, comme tout son portrait de la princesse en question. Le Groupe c'est les rimeurs courtisans auxquels sont dus les 111 rondeaux, les 25 chansons et les 3 ballades (seulement) des *Albums*, avec un dictier en dialogue et 22 textes latins. Sauf Marguerite pour une pièce (xxv, autographe), et Jean Le Maire pour deux (cxxxix et cxxx) les auteurs ne sont pas identifiés. Mais ils sont fort identiques. Excepté qu'on voit se dessiner çà et là de petits blocs un peu distincts, il y a une remarquable homogénéité dans l'Impersonnel. Et, il faut bien le dire, dans le Médiocre. Le thème, c'est Amour en ses formes désireuses et languoureuses avec, parfois, l'expression des ennuis de l'existence, *mérencolie* et tout son train. On "pense" en série, à coup de proverbes et la sensibilité consiste en extases froides. Pourtant telles pièces où l'auteur est sincère parce que narquois (un des traits du temps) ont du relief. Ainsi lIII, lVI, lXX, lXXXVIII.

Au reste il faut se dire que l'intime association de la musique et de la poésie—traitée comme support de la première—explique le nonchaloir ou l'absence de l'expression verbale personnelle.¹ On pourrait paraphraser le mot de Figaro et écrire: Ce qui se chante ne vaut pas la peine d'être dit. A ce propos, rappelons que le texte musical des *Albums* est dû à Agricola, Brumel, de la Rue, Compère, Josquin Desprès, en somme l'école du grand Ockeghem. Bien que M. F. n'écrive ni n'étudie ce texte musical il a (pp. 44-47) au sujet du *motet* et de la teneur des chants de judicieuses et originales observations. Ne peut-on dire que la Musique a fait la Lyrique (au sens antique et propre) du moyen-âge mais l'a défaits au sens moderne de poésie subjective?

Et puis, pour être juste, il faut dans ces productions impersonnelles des *Albums* reconnaître parfois une certaine aspiration à l'élégance formelle qui frôle la Renaissance. Même en ce qui regarde le penser et le sentir, la subtilité emblématique de tels de ces rondeaux (xlII, lXXX, par exemple) fait un petit peu songer à l'école lyonnaise. Au fait savons-nous bien si Scève qui doit tant aux Italiens ne doit absolument rien aux Bourguignons?

Enfin, comme M. F. l'a si bien vu, l'intérêt de ce groupe n'est pas sa valeur mais son fait même: un cercle autour d'une patronne qui était traditionaliste et cosmopolite tout ensemble. Il y avait là un climat qui valait mieux que les fruits.

Curieuse époque décidément que cet automne du moyen âge: à certains égards un ritualisme figé et, à d'autres, transition, fluidité!

¹ C'est là une des justes observations de M. W. F. Patterson dans le livre de lui dont nous avons rendu compte ici-même.

... Ainsi en est-il de la langue à laquelle M. F. consacre une brève étude qui met en valeur "l'instabilité, l'absence de norme" (pp. 59-67). Récemment la publication par E. Droz de *Soties* du recueil Trepperel est venue (mais cette fois pour la langue parlée, gesticulée, populaire enfin, du XV^e siècle) apporter un nouvel aliment à nos curiosités à ce point de vue. On apprendrait beaucoup de choses si on pouvait tenir sous le même regard des manifestations, socialement aussi contrastantes, que lesdites *Soties* et les *Albums*. Il y faudrait joindre ces quelque 600 rondeaux que M. F. a indexés avec d'intéressantes remarques dans un article sur *Rondeaux d'amour du XV^e siècle*, paru en 1935 dans le Volume 16 des *Harvard Studies* ... in *Literature*. M. F. identifie un tiers environ de ces rondeaux comme se retrouvant en des recueils ultérieurs. Ainsi l'un d'eux, du plein XV^e, reparait en 1582 dans le *Courtizan Amoureux*. Indice—non du tout unique—de la survivance du courtois médiéval.

Nous avouons aimer la hardiesse sensée avec laquelle M. F. bouscule des distinctions convenues entre poésie aristocratique et poésie bourgeoise. Et la façon dont, sans se faire illusion sur l'originalité des Rhétoriciens, il sait mesurer le pas que ces pauvres Velléitaires de l'Art ont fait vers les Volontaires de la Pléaïde. Dans le champ du *Quattrocento* bourguignon et armagnac M. F. fera son chemin et sa marque. Il offre un dosage heureux de l'esprit de géométrie et de l'esprit de finesse.²

LOUIS CONS

Columbia University

² Dans l'édition des *Albums* donnée par M. F. le sens peut se rétablir parfois au delà de l'extrême prudence sceptique de l'éditeur. Au rondeau VI, vers 6, la graphie *A livré* éclaire la phrase que le rétablissement d'un (*A livrer*) rend incompréhensible. Au rondeau XXXI le vers 5 semble devoir être compris comme opposant *promptement à credo*, un *credo* étant ici un prêt à échéance.

Au rondeau XLII, le 3^e vers contient un calembour déplorable entre "seconde personne" c'est-à-dire *tu* et *tue* (Il est question de quelqu'un qui se tue).

Le rondeau XLIV "pur galimatias," dit M. F., n'est pas inintelligible. Il a, comme d'autres de ces pièces, la marque d'un auteur féminin qui a lu Christine de Pisan.

Le rondeau LIV s'éclaire si on comprend *souvre*, au vers 9, comme venant de *supra* avec le sens de *reste*, *d'extra* et *ouvre*, au vers 10, comme une forme non *d'ouvrir* mais *d'ouvrer*. Au rondeau LV, vers 11, *suppetit* de *suppetere* peut se comprendre comme "est encore présente, est encore sous la main pour mon usage" (Il s'agit d'une maîtresse douteuse qui s'en va mais n'est point encore partie).

Au rondeau LIX si on rétablit, aux vers 8 et 11, *assouvi* et *deservi* pour *assouvir* et *deservir*, le sens revient, bien que la rime avec *servir* du dernier vers tombe—pour l'oeil. Mais il doit y avoir là un problème de prononciation.

Au rondeau LXIII, vers 6, *parcial soy tenir* retrouve un sens si on le rapproche du vers 8 qui dit: "De ma part riens je ne propose."

On notera comme cause d'obscurité gratuite dans ces pièces la confusion de *que* et de *qui*.

Romans français du moyen âge, Essais. Par ANDRÉE BRUEL. Paris: Droz, 1934. Pp. 446. Fr. 24.

Sous un titre qui n'annonce pas une étude complète (*Romans* . . . et non *Les Romans* . . .) et un sous-titre modeste mais spacieux, *Essais*, on nous donne ici la seule biographie du roman médiéval que nous ayons.¹ On regrettera l'absence de *Tristan* et du *Graal*, tâche lourde et délicate que Mlle Bruel eût été digne d'entreprendre. Mais en ce qu'elle nous donne elle nous a bien servis. Car son livre qui ne se veut point érudit est bien informé. *Et il est bien écrit.*

Le lecteur, une fois ce livre solide et plaisant refermé, garde en l'esprit une chaîne dont les deux bouts sont Chrétien de Troyes et *Jehan de Paris* et les anneaux principaux Jean Renart, *Flamenca*, les *romans tragiques*, puis les humoresques et les nouvelles du XV^e siècle. Quand nous disons "une chaîne" c'est de notre part une image qui, si on peut dire, prend parti. Ce parti, cette idée c'est la continuité du roman médiéval au sein des œuvres diverses que Mlle B. nous présente. Œuvres peu nombreuses, auxquelles manquent ces types importants que nous avons dits plus haut, mais qui sont tout de même représentatives. Or nous voyons—d'après ce qu'on nous donne—que la fameuse distinction entre deux plans plus ou moins hermétiquement séparés, Courtois et Bourgeois, ne joue plus très bien. Il n'y a en effet aucune de ces œuvres où on puisse trouver ni le Courtois ni le Bourgeois à l'état pur. Chrétien de Troyes? Mais si sa matière est courtoise, son sens intime est haut-bourgeois. Jean Renart? Mais sa vision du chevaleresque même est d'un réalisme collé au sol. Les romans tragiques? Mais leurs dénouements son du tragique populaire,² bien plus que du Courtois.

¹ A part les chapitres dispersés des histoires de la littérature. Les travaux sur les origines, les sources, d'un Faral ou d'un Loomis, d'un Ch. v. Langlois sur l'étoffe sociale des romans du moyen âge, ne sont pas par définition des synthèses du genre que nous voulons dire. Et moins encore les nombreux travaux sur des aspects ou des romans particuliers. Seule l'étude de W. Söderhjelm—plus appuyée mais plus restreinte par son champ—de *La Nouvelle au XV^e siècle* rentrait dans notre idée de biographie d'un genre.

² Ces dénouements apparentent les romans tragiques à l'Ovide des *Métamorphoses*. Et l'on pourrait parler ici pour ces romans d'une dérivation ovidienne, humaniste. Mais il faut se dire qu'Ovide avait puisé ces sombres histoires dans le folk lore, dans le peuple. A côté de l'Ovide "savant" qui par ses analyses a fourni des linéaments au Courtois il y a un Ovide "populaire" ou du moins coïncidant avec le populaire.

Ce que nous disons là au sujet des dénouements des *romans tragiques* s'applique au dénouement de *Tristan*, à l'histoire des deux voiles: Souvenir "humaniste" si l'on veut, mais coïncidant avec le "populaire."

Dans ces romans tragiques nous sommes tentés de voir des "dramas de la haute" contés par des gens du commun. On y jouit du contraste, si aimé du peuple de tout temps, entre les apparences de la noblesse et le déchaînement des passions communes.

Quant au Bourgeois il a l'air de triompher à plein dans, par exemple, *Les xv Joyes*, une humoresque parfaitement libérée de tout élément courtois. Mais qu'on songe un peu à ce dur détachement, à ce mépris pour les choses et les gens de la vie commune! Combien peu bourgeois en est l'esprit, le sens intime! Mais bien clérical-aristocrate (comme à notre avis le *Pathelin*). *Les Cent Nouvelles?* Bourgeoises en la matière, en l'esprit si on veut (mais encore ceci n'irait pas sans difficultés), mais ressassées par de grands seigneurs qui sûrement se sentaient de plain pied avec cet esprit-là? Et qui jamais tracera dans *Jehan de Saintré*, dans *La Sale*, et dans celui-là qui fit *Jehan de Paris*, la frontière entre Courtois et Bourgeois?

Le *Graal*, que malheureusement on ne nous donne point, fut, lui, sorti de cette ligne, pour se perdre dans le plan mystique. Mais le plan qui se dessine là c'est celui de l'Ascèse opposée au siècle, au monde aussi bien chevaleresque, courtois que bourgeois. Sous le regard de feu du monasticisme bernardien devaient fondre comme neige ces distinctions de castes, dont on nous semble surfaire et la séparation hermétique et l'influence littéraire.

Ce ne sont là que quelques-uns des problèmes que soulève la vue perspective tracée d'une main très personnelle par Mlle B., avec tant d'intelligence serviable et d'élégante fermeté.³

LOUIS CONS

Columbia University

Etat présent des études sur Villon. Par LOUIS CONS. Paris: Belles-Lettres, 1936. Pp. 161. 10 fr.

The title of this book might lead one to expect little more than a *bibliographie raisonnée*. Instead, M. Cons has given us a study of Villon through the ages that not only projects the poet against the background of his own day, but so synthesizes the views of succeeding epochs and various countries about him that at times these luminous pages constitute a miniature history of literary ideas.¹

³ Mlle. B. donne le texte original de ses citations avec une modernisation fidèle. Il y a quelques menues exceptions à cette fidélité: P. 64, la traduction de "rantiers" par "hommes" affaiblit (peut-être inévitablement) le dur sens de l'expression de Fénelon. En revanche, p. 69, la trad. "passion" pour "deduit" force le sens. Ce n'est pas à proprement parler de sentiment mais de conduite qu'il est question ici. Il y a aussi une légère inexactitude de ton et de force dans la traduction que M. Wilmotte, suivi par Mlle B., donne de "retraire" par "imiter" alors que "ressembler" est ici le vrai (p. 19). Page 23, le difficile vers 2442 de *Erec* (dont Foerster a esquissé l'interprétation) est traduit comme si *el*, qui est neutre, était féminin. P. 59, l'ordre des notes 2 et 3 est interverti.

¹ Cf. the chapter-headings: Villon Ancien Régime, Villon et les Romantiques, Villon redécouvert, Allemagne, Angleterre, Espagne, Italie, etc.

Moreover, into his delicate, subtle and penetrating analyses of the works of others, the author has woven interpretations of his own that are original and constructive. Thus, to take one example among many, in estimating Siciliano's recent work, he justly regards it as "un maître livre" (p. 133), but keenly observes: "dans son livre, où il y a tant d'esprit, c'est l'Esprit du moyen âge qui manque le plus . . ." (p. 122), and proceeds himself to supply that want by sketching a deft and vivid picture of the later middle ages.

The volume also makes clear Cons' personal conception of the poet, a Villon whose intense egotism was tempered by intelligence and a certain disinterested objectivity, a Villon *réel* and a Villon *vrai*, a man who was *un raillard pas mal cynique* but who could become on occasion *grand, quasi pur* (pp. 70-1, 136). It is difficult in a volume so packed with good things to point out the most fruitful suggestions. Especially stimulating should be the new material in the chapter on the Romantics, who would seem to have appreciated Villon far less than is usually believed (pp. 38-60), and the pages in which the *Testament* is plausibly regarded as lacking unity of composition but as revealing a certain unity of passion inspired by the poet's desperate hatred of Thibaud d'Aussigny (pp. 138 ff.). Some may question the amount of space devoted to a Bernard or a Desonay, but all will be grateful for Cons' appraisal of the work of such men as Schwob, Champion, Thuasne, Neri and Siciliano, in which, as throughout the book, an incisive clarity of judgment mingles with an urbane reasonableness. In short, this is a volume "d'un savant autant que d'un lettré," which, like that earlier volume of Gaston Paris, should appeal to all who would understand Villon.²

GRACE FRANK

Bryn Mawr College

Guernes de Pont-Sainte-Maxence: La Vie de Saint Thomas Becket.

Éditée par EMMANUEL WALBERG. Paris: Classiques français du moyen âge 77 (1936). Pp. xxiv + 265. Fr. 24.

The account of Becket's life and death by Guernes of Pont-Sainte-Maxence is the most significant of all the literary versions.¹ Its tenor is hagiographical rather than historiographical. Guernes gives us various data as to its composition in a kind of prologue and epilogue, ll. 141-165 and 6156-6180. He completed it at

² Three small slips will doubtless be corrected in a second edition: p. 23, last line, read 1456 for 1461; p. 84 supply a reference to the foot-note; p. 104 read Burns for Burne. Some reference to the unreliability of the variants supplied by Thuasne's edition would have been welcome.

¹ P. A. Brown, *The Development of the Legend of Thomas Becket*, Philadelphia, 1930, p. 10.

Canterbury in 1174. It is divided into 1236 monorimed strophes of five alexandrine verses. The poem survives in five main manuscripts: B, H, P, C, W. Back in 1838 Bekker edited B quite sedulously, and in 1844 he reproduced H to fill in the lacunae. Hippeau's edition of 1859 was a faulty reproduction of the faulty manuscript P. In 1922 Walberg published a very satisfactory text, using B as the basal manuscript and H for the lacunae. As for the textual emendations proposed by Breuer and Schultz-Gora, Walberg has justified his rejection of them.² Breuer has also published³ certain variants of C although C, as well as W, is practically useless in establishing the text. On p. xiv of the 1936 edition Walberg describes his first edition ambiguously as an "édition critique établie à l'aide de tous les manuscrits connus"; yet the difference between his two texts is well nigh negligible.⁴ In the introduction to the present edition, Walberg summarizes his extensive and valuable investigations into the history, literature, and philology⁵ of the Becket theme. To the selective glossary may be added the following terms, which combine (1) forms having a peculiar orthography, (2) words used in a rare sense, (3) corrections of misprints, and (4) differences of interpretation:

s'aitier 3191 *prendre bon courage*; aparmaines 3016; metre en araisunement 2434 *prévenir, consulter*; asensement 3146 *avis, avertissement*; en bescoz 5608: G. Paris, *Romania*, xviii (1899), 145; busuig 5920 *besoin*; chute 3938 *coude*; en defit 4968: Tobler-Lommatzsch II, 1288; demaineté 2467 *domaine direct*; devié 2433, 4972 *interdit, excommunication*: Godefroy II, 699a; estreindre le conseil 462; falser de covenant 1018 *se dérober à ce qu'on a promis*: the erroneous reference to *Gui de Cambrai* in the 1922 ed., p. 238, is corrected in *Romania*, lviii (1932), 439 (cf. *Yvain* 2660); for 1455 *fors, sauf, excepté*: Godefroy IV, 95 (cf. H. Pflaum, *Romania*, lix (1933), 403); *fors* (après une proposition négative) 2280, 5417 *mais*: *Chroniques de Froissart* xix, 222; *aveir gros quer* 4974; *heser* 6047 *mettre les heuses, chausser*; *sei tierce main* 1406 *par l'affirmation en justice de trois personnes*: 1922 ed., p. 243 (*La Curie de Sainte-Palaye* VII, 223b; F. Liebermann, *Die Gesetze der Angelsachsen*, II, 139); *metler* 6150 *machiner*; *plain* 163 *plénitude*; 299 *loyal*; 1407 *évident*; 1467 *clair*; 4375 *entier*; *el present* 2341 *en présence de, devant*; *faire le purquei* 2359 *instruire*; *quaranteine* 6051 *pénitence durant quarante jours*: 1922 ed., p. 312; *salse* 6150 *affaire désagréable*: 1922 ed., p. 316 (Godefroy, *Compl.*, x, 618); *estre a us* 3853 *avoir l'habitude*: 1922 ed., p. 276.

RAPHAEL LEVY

University of Baltimore

² *Lit. ger. rom. Phil.*, xlv (1924), 187-9; *Z R Ph.*, li (1931), 548-568.

³ *Z R Ph.*, xliii (1923), 356-363.

⁴ Even the distinction between *é* and *è* is preserved.

⁵ I suggest that on page xxiii *auçur* 3099, *auchur* 4459 < *altiozem* be omitted; *hauçur* 2929 reflects the influence of *haut*.

Au Temps de l'Encyclopédie, L'Académie de Dijon de 1740 à 1793.

Par ROGER TISSERAND. Paris: Boivin (1936). Pp. 683.

Les Concurrents de J.-J. Rousseau à l'Académie de Dijon pour le Prix de 1754. Par ROGER TISSERAND. Paris: Boivin (1936).

Pp. 219.

Nous avons déjà une monographie de l'Académie de Marseille (par Dassy, 1877), une autre de l'Académie de Bordeaux (par J. de Gères, 1879), une autre de Besançon (par Pingault, 1892); plus récemment un volume sur *Les Académies provinciales, salons ou sociétés savantes* (par A. Féron, Rouen 1934), et les livres de D. Mornet constamment cités par M. Tisserand,—pour nous faire saisir l'ambiance du siècle des "philosophes." Il y avait aussi, en ce qui concerne Dijon en particulier, *La Vie littéraire à Dijon au XVIII^e siècle*, de l'abbé Deberre (1902), et surtout le gros livre récent de M. Bouchard, *De l'Humanisme à l'Encyclopédie: l'Esprit public en Bourgogne sous l'ancien régime* (Paris, 1930). La présente formidable monographie de M. Tisserand est une histoire extrêmement minutieuse, disons même un peu prolixe, de cette Académie qui s'illustra auprès de la postérité surtout pour avoir lancé Rousseau dans sa glorieuse carrière. On y travailla du reste beaucoup dans cette Académie qui reçut ses lettres patentes le 30 juin 1740 et qui sombra comme toutes ses sœurs dans l'ouragan de la Révolution; elle se releva à la Restauration, mais l'histoire de M. Tisserand s'arrête en 1793. A très peu d'exceptions près—sauf deux *Discours* de Rousseau et un mémoire du marquis d'Argenson—on ne peut signaler que d'honnêtes, et parfois solides travaux; M. Tisserand en a compté exactement 1867 et il nous renseigne sur un grand nombre d'entre eux. Qu'on s'intéresse spécialement à Rousseau ou non, il est bien certain que seules les quelques pages se rapportant à ses deux *Discours* présentent un intérêt exceptionnel (p. 550 à 556, *plus*, ici et là, quelques allusions en passant). Les lettres et les arts intéressèrent du reste toujours modérément l'Académie de Dijon; les sciences accaparaient presque exclusivement l'attention, à Dijon comme dans les autres Académies provinciales selon M. Mornet.

A notre savoir c'est la première fois que nous avons quelque chose de clair sur Rousseau à l'Académie de Dijon. Il en ressort ceci, que le sujet du *Discours* de 1749 fut reçu en quelque sorte en contrebande par les membres de l'Académie: "Un esprit faux de l'Académie [Claude Gelot], écrit Ruffey dans son *Histoire secrète*, proposa ce problème: *Si les arts et les sciences ont contribué à épurer les mœurs*. Il fut adopté sans réflexion et donné au public pour sujet du prix de 1750" (cité p. 186); les Académiciens ne furent pas moins . . . étourdis, ensuite, en couronnant un mémoire si révolutionnaire préférablement à celui de l'orthodoxe abbé Tal-

bert; l'ennui résultant des critiques et des sarcasmes fut grand, et la mauvaise conscience des Académiciens, persistante,—si bien qu'en 1756 encore le coupable (Gelot) sentait encore qu'il devait faire amende honorable en lisant en séance du 17 décembre un mémoire intitulé "La société vengée des attentats d'un misanthrope, ou réfutation du Discours de M. Rousseau de Genève sur l'Inégalité des conditions."¹

La question du *Second Discours* fait l'objet de la petite thèse de M. Tisserand. Elle explique plus en détail les raisons qui firent refuser à Rousseau le prix de 1754. Clairement ce n'est pas la longueur qui fut le motif déterminant, (quand même il est bien vrai que le mémoire est beaucoup plus long que tous les autres présentés), mais c'est que l'Académie avait été si vivement critiquée pour avoir couronné le *Discours* de 1750. M. Tisserand le prouve abondamment à notre sens: L'Académie avait à se faire pardonner. On dira: mais les auteurs n'étaient pas connus. Non, mais le contenu suffisait à montrer un esprit aussi dangereux que celui du concours de 1750; et, d'ailleurs, on a des raisons de croire que l'Académie avait eu vent du fait que le mémoire N^o. 6 était de la main de Rousseau. M. T. suggère qu'il avait été lu d'avance par certains membres et écarté d'emblée. Le mémoire couronné—tout à fait orthodoxe—fut celui du chanoine Talbert (qui avait été en concurrence avec Rousseau déjà en 1750): une véritable homélie expliquant tant bien que mal que le monde est ce qu'il est, bien mauvais certes; or, s'il était pire, ce serait simplement le chaos; il y a donc lieu d'être encore bien reconnaissant à Dieu de n'avoir pas infligé à l'homme le pire. La manuscrit de Rousseau est aujourd'hui perdu; il l'avait réclamé pour l'impression; ainsi on ne sait pas jusqu'à quel point le texte original a été modifié. M. T. donne quelques indications aussi au sujet du mémoire du marquis d'Argenson (N^o. 5); celui-ci était si désireux d'être couronné qu'il fit savoir sans trop de discrétion qu'il était l'auteur—mais la probité de l'Académie refusa la suggestion.

Le gros du volume consiste en une édition des onze mémoires sur treize du concours (un autre manuscrit manque outre celui de Rousseau)—édition qui ne nous paraît pas d'un intérêt prodigieux. Sera-t-il permis de demander pourquoi M. T. n'a pas plutôt édité avec soin le *Discours* de Rousseau—car cette édition manque. Ce qu'il a préféré faire lui a donné l'occasion de montrer une sérieuse érudition en indiquant les rapprochements à faire entre ces mémoires et la pensée contemporaine. On peut s'étonner, cependant,

¹ Disons en passant que tout cela n'empêchait pas l'Académie de saisir les occasions qui se présentèrent plus tard en couronnant Rousseau pour rappeler sa perspicacité. Par exemple, en 1791, lorsque l'Académie déplora publiquement la mort de Mirabeau, l'orateur s'écriait: "A qui convient-il de remplir ce devoir plus qu'à l'Académie à laquelle la France et toutes les nations doivent l'auteur du *Contrat social*?"

de ce titre de "sources" qu'il donne à un chapitre. Si les auteurs avaient eux-mêmes plus souvent dit que tel ou tel auteur était "source" soit! mais c'est le cas si rarement qu'on ne peut pas plus indiquer comme *sources* Locke, Barbeyrac, Montesquieu, Bossuet ou La Bruyère qu'on peut indiquer comme n'étant *pas sources* les ouvrages de Voltaire (p. 40). Il s'agit presque toujours d'idées qui sont "dans l'air" comme on dit: Qui aujourd'hui oserait affirmer chez un contemporain parlant des droits de l'ouvrier, de dictature politique, de "conscientious objectors," que la *source* soit directement Marx, Nietzsche ou Tolstoi?

ALBERT SCHINZ

University of Pennsylvania

L'Œuvre et l'âme de Jules Renard. Par LÉON GUICHARD. Paris: Nizet et Bastard, 1936, Pp. 599.

L'Interprétation graphique cinématographique et musicale des œuvres de Jules Renard. Par LÉON GUICHARD. Paris: Nizet et Bastard, 1936, Pp. 228.

These two large excellently-printed companion-theses constitute both a noteworthy example of scholarship in the field of literary history and criticism and an imposing tribute to the genius of Jules Renard. The main portion of the principal thesis is divided into four thorough-going, well-balanced chapters on Renard's literary aims and achievements. Here Guichard studies, with the aid of copious citations from Renard's writings and especially from his journal and his correspondence, the artist's development from mere imitativeness in poetry and prose to complete mastery of his medium. Renard's juvenile "plaquette" of verses, *les Roses*, has little in common with his mature work, for there are lacking "dans ce léger bagage poétique" two of the most characteristic qualities of the man and the writer: "*la sincérité et la simplicité.*"¹ In his first prose works, too, Renard made a "faux départ," reflecting at every turn his reading of George Sand, Flaubert, Daudet, and especially Maupassant. But it was not long before Renard had found himself and was launched upon the task of combating the unrealities even of the realistic literature of the day by making his own writing parallel as closely as possible the life about him. For (p. 40) "Renard avait horreur du faux, dans les livres comme dans la vie." G. demonstrates how Renard made it his business to strip of all the sentimentality and conventional falsehoods in which the current literature had cloaked them such subjects as the young girl, woman, love, the child, nature, peasants, and animals.

¹ *L'Œuvre et l'âme de Jules Renard*, p. 25.

This Renard achieved both in his pseudo-fictional writings, designated by G. not novels or short-stories but simply "des proses," and in his plays; in the latter, he rebelled against Brieux's "pièces à thèse" and Porto-Riche's "pièces d'amour"—"les unes et les autres étant d'après lui également éloignées de la vie" (p. 82). Thus, much of Renard's work was written with the aim to "dégager une vérité trop ensevelie sous les voiles de l'art" and seems to G. to be "une école d'équilibre et de santé" (pp. 90, 91). In the longest and meatiest chapter of his study, "l'Homme dans l'œuvre," G. shows that Renard substituted for the "mensonges" of his contemporaries material based on his own physical and spiritual experiences. All his important writings mirror either the "côté Guitty" (his life in Paris, so called because Lucien Guitty was one of his closest friends) or the "côté Chitry" (his participation in the activities of the humble village of Chitry-les-Mines in which he was reared and in which, once he had established himself in the world of letters, he spent about half of each year). Finally, G. gives us a careful analysis of the distinctively original traits of Renard's work. G.'s study is supplemented by a series of five appendices which provide a wealth of bibliographical and iconographical information: on Renard's reading, the extant manuscripts and the successive editions of his writings, critical books and articles, and the performances of his plays both in Paris and in the provinces.

G.'s complementary thesis is an elaborate examination of the illustrations of Renard's works (by such gifted artists with the pen and brush as Steinlen, Vallotton, Toulouse-Lautrec, and Bonnard, as well as by lesser craftsmen), of the two cinematographic versions of *Poil de Carotte*, and of the musical settings of several of the *Histoires naturelles* (especially that of Maurice Ravel, for which G. has the highest praise). This study, too, is furnished with an extensive bibliography, and both volumes are very well indexed. G.'s conclusions may be given in his own words. Of Renard the literary artist he says: "Épris de poésie, mais passionné de vérité, il a su garder, entre les deux, un équilibre difficile, et représenter la vie la plus profonde en des pages d'une netteté et d'une sobriété vraiment françaises et classiques" (p. 390). As for the interpretation of Renard's writings in other media, G. insists that the second cinematographic *Poil de Carotte* is, despite its good qualities, "compliqué dans son intrigue, édulcoré et simplifié dans ses caractères," and points out that the works have been illustrated most frequently in pen-and-ink but most successfully in the music of Ravel, "qui résolvait précisément le problème auquel Jules Renard avait voué son art et sa vie: être poète en restant vrai."²

This summary of G.'s two volumes leaves little to be added. The author has treated his subject "con amore"; he has had at his

² *L'Interprétation graphique etc.*, p. 173 and p. 202.

disposal all the necessary materials, including some hitherto "inédit," he has drawn a life-sized portrait of Renard as he is framed in his writings, and he has written down his findings in an eminently readable style. He has proved the inadequacy of the common conception of Renard as the author of only one significant work, *Poil de Carotte*, and he has fixed Renard's place in the stream of twentieth-century literature and art. A slight tendency to exaggerate Renard's importance and to belittle other great French writers in his favor is manifest; but this may be ascribed to zeal and certainly not to ignorance. All in all, G. has produced the definitive study of Renard.

AARON SCHAFFER

The University of Texas

Ferdinand Brunetière; the Evolution of a Critic. By ELTON HOCKING. Madison, 1936. Pp. 273. (Univ. of Wis. Studies, 36.)

It is now thirty years since the death of Brunetière. So great had been his popularity, so widespread his influence that a temporary eclipse of his fame was inevitable. In the last few years critics are once more turning to him. Professor Elton Hocking of Northwestern University gives us a work which is easily the most noteworthy contribution in the last two decades. To know Brunetière thoroughly is no easy matter. It requires a great deal of reading in a field of widely varying subjects. Moreover, it requires scrupulous attention to a multitude of dates because the development of his thought is one of the most interesting features in such a study. One does not need to read very far to feel that Mr. Hocking is quite at home with his subject and, while sympathetic, ready to call attention to defects whenever he meets them.

First we have a biography in which Brunetière's work and the development of his main thought are already outlined. This method necessitates a certain amount of repetition but, on the whole, is perhaps the most satisfactory. Then, in truly classical style, the critic is studied under three headings: the traditionalist, the rationalist, the moralist, and we are told that these correspond roughly to the three periods of his productive life.

From 1875 to 1886, Brunetière is presented as working mainly under the influence of Nisard and waging relentless war on the Naturalists in the name of classical tradition. In the second period, 1886 to 1895, we see the critic building up a rational foundation for his doctrine—Schopenhauer being the guiding star. Then came the famous visit to the Vatican and the ringing proclamation of the bankruptcy of science as a substitute for religion. This last period, 1895-1906, throws Brunetière into the field of apologetics

where he meets for the most part with unexpected and bitter disappointment. During this time "he deserted the field of art for the field of action." (P. 211.) Now it is quite evident that Mr. Hocking is not the dupe of this division, but he runs the risk of giving to readers, who are not so well informed, a false idea of Brunetière's evolution. His traditionalism, which was *sui generis*, seems to me even more prominent in the latter part of his life and his interest in morality is evident in his earliest work. As Mr. Hocking remarks, "it is certain that his own philosophy of art was inseparable from his philosophy of life." (P. 134.) In that philosophy, ethics always held the place of prominence. We cannot dispense with metaphysics because a stable moral code would then be impossible. This ethical preoccupation colours all Brunetière's literary criticism. "If ever there was a philosophic critic, it was Brunetière, and the criticism of his last period varied as a function of his ethics." (P. 223.) And I believe it was equally true of the second period.

When he comes to the difficult and delicate problem of Brunetière's conversion, Mr. Hocking is evidently anxious to be especially thorough and fair. On the whole, he succeeds very well. But I should like to call attention to a couple of points. He says repeatedly that faith for Brunetière was a matter of the will and not of the intellect. He points out that, in the famous speech at Lille in 1900, Brunetière distinguished carefully between what he knew and what he believed. I see nothing startling in this. St. Thomas Aquinas makes exactly the same distinction. As a matter of fact, both the intellect and the will play an essential role in faith. Another point: "social reasons" for accepting the Catholic Church may explain a Charles Maurras but scarcely a Brunetière. "I have other reasons," he said, "more personal and more intimate!" (P. 235.) And, we might add, more effective.

As to the theory of evolution, Mr. Hocking sees it as a strong influence pervading the whole of Brunetière's life and staying with him to the end. This is acceptable only if we bear in mind that he transformed the theory to suit his purpose.

A few more objections might be raised but they would not alter the fact that we have here the best single book that has yet been published on Brunetière.

L. J. BONDY

St. Michael's College, Toronto

LOPE DE VEGA, *Cancionero Teatral*. Prólogo y notas de J. ROBLES PAZOS. Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins Press, 1935. Pp. 114. \$1.25.

The *raison d'être* of this unpretentious collection of 138 songs

from various plays of Lope de Vega has not been precisely defined. To sheave such fascinating materials into a single book is in itself an obvious contribution to the convenience of studying an unquestionably important element of Lope's drama. And of course the mere reading of these largely popular and often traditional lyrics, even when they have been lifted from Lope's appropriate settings, affords an amenity for whose promotion one must, in all decency, be very grateful. The enjoyment of the mellow entertainment they provide against one's *momentos muertos* has been facilitated considerably by Sr. Robles' clear, quick editing. But the auspices under which he has published his work lead one to expect a far more complete, intensive and important study than at present he has cared to provide. One regrets that notwithstanding the assumption of the reader's familiarity with the genres included, Sr. Robles has seemingly preferred to cater to the Hispanistic amateur rather than to the more inquisitive and more exacting professional scholar.

Though his anthology contains some 77 items more than have been gathered by Montesinos (*Clás. Cast.*, 68), Sr. Robles has by no means attempted to make his collection complete, nor has he fixed on any appreciable basis for his apparently arbitrary process of selection. All of the songs included merit their place, but any volume of either of the Academy's editions of Lope is too rich in other *canciones*, both of intrinsic virtues and of interest as variations of generic motifs, not to compel a more exhaustive and definitive study of this attractive field on some subsequent occasion. That the editor's notes reveal his acquaintance with numerous songs which have been omitted, but which are important for their obvious relation to pieces that have been included, only teases a curiosity already taut. One is further and perhaps more keenly disappointed to find that despite the potentialities of his subject matter, Sr. Robles' 11 pages of *Prólogo* and his 10 pages of *Notas*, both rather perfunctory, embody so relatively little of consequence that has not already been noted either by Henríquez Ureña, Menéndez y Pelayo, Menéndez Pidal, Cejador, or Montesinos. Generally what Sr. Robles does say is in itself quite beyond reproach, for his remarks, elementary and limited though they may be, are always pertinent and, cautiously avoiding controversy, have closely followed the larger and deeper footprints of his authoritative predecessors. Too often, however, his notes are merely a succinct reference to fuller treatment elsewhere, and sometimes they neglect even to cite illuminating information that lies within easy reach. The utility of the whole book would have been greatly increased had the *Notas* regularly embodied cross-references to precisely those parts of the *Prólogo* of which each song is most illustrative. But a still more serious defect is that the unwary reader is left without the slightest hint that certain songs, particularly the *canciones legendarias* taken from *El caballero de Olmedo*, *Peribañez*,

Fuente Ovejuna, etc., constitute an organic part of their respective dramas and in themselves function as a technical device worthy of minute study. Sr. Robles' mere statement regarding the derivation of such plays or their songs is inadequate if not misleading. Then too one especially misses in this work some systematic effort to analyze strophic and line structure, particularly since the present classification according to general subjects (*Canciones de boda*, *Bienvenidas*, *Trébole*, etc.) or under such very elastic headings as *Seguidillas*, *Villancicos*, *Serranillas*, *Letras sacras*, or *Letras diversas* is admittedly not very exact.

Beyond the mere process of assemblage, the primary objective of this collection, and so its principal contribution, seems to have been to clarify the texts selected—to renovate their previous punctuation, correct their indubitable errors, separate their *estribillos* from their *glosas*, and methodically divide the latter into their component strophes. Sr. Robles has clearly succeeded in making his editing in many respects quite superior to that of the notoriously unsatisfactory *B. A. E.* and Academy editions, and for good measure has corrected the obvious slips of Montesinos. But even so, his texts cannot pretend to be definitive. That editorial vigilance has not sufficed to prevent the intrusion of new errors is quite understandable. But that Sr. Robles should have been satisfied to take his texts "en su mayoría de reimpresiones modernas," without specifying more exactly their provenance, leaves their authenticity a matter of conjecture and thus lamentably impairs their value. For even the song from *El cordobés valeroso Pedro Carbonero* (cxx) the original text, readily available in Montesinos' edition of the autograph manuscript (*T. A. E.*, vii, 1929, vv. 843-62), has apparently not been consulted. Surely there can be no question of the advisability of accepting Lope's own reading of *Riberitas* (1), *y en* for *en* (10), or *lástima* for *compasión* (16). But still more inexplicably inadequate is the mutilated text chosen for cxviii (from *Lo que ha de ser*), for thereby Sr. Robles not only omits 6 lines at the end of the first stanza (*Rapacillo . . . divertirla*, Acad., N., xii, 1930, 387a), following Hartzzenbusch who, as Cotarelo notes, "sólo pudo tener a la vista la defectuosa Parte xxv de 1647," but to make any sense at all he is then compelled to read, erroneously, *viéndola* instead of *viendo* at 11 and *enamorarla* instead of *enamorarle* at 12, further disagreeing with the quite superior Academy text, based on the 1614 manuscript, by reading *Salíó* instead of *Sale* at 1, and at 17-19 *la niña, que yo no quiero ser Amor* instead of *niña, que no le quiero; sé tu Amor*. One suspects that texts not so easily established may not have been granted much greater consideration.

In general, Sr. Robles seems to have underestimated in these songs the constancy of community participation, the almost inevitable choral quality of the *estribillo*, at which all the *Músicos*,

if not the entire company, probably joined in. Although he demonstrates in his *Prólogo* (p. 5) that he is quite aware of the two principal phenomena involved, he is not always consistent in his punctuation of those songs whose refrains are obviously sung in chorus. This is one of his most common editorial faults, and might partially be explained by his consistent omission of all speech captions in songs and dances for two participants or for chorus and soloist. In 11 instances (I, V, XX, XXVI, XLI, XLII, LIX, LXIII, LXIX, CIX, CXI) the general purpose of clarifying texts would have been appreciably furthered by the retention of Lope's guide lines. By the same token, even in those songs whose original texts do not actually employ speech captions to mark the assumption of the refrain by general chorus, analogous breaks should regularly be indicated by additional spacing in at least III, X, XI, XII, XX, XLII, LX, LXIII, LXIV, LXVI, LXVII, LXXII, CV, CVI, CXIV and CXXXVIII.

Without a complete list of at least the 17th century variants any adequate reconstruction of Sr. Robles' texts is manifestly impossible. Tentatively, there are, in addition to the items mentioned above, some 40 questionable readings which I should prefer not to accept. To correct obvious errata, read p. 4, 22, *quiere* for *quiera*; IV, 3, *Premiad* for *Premiar*; V, 6, *es* for *as*; VI, 1, comma after *habéis*; XX, end, *San Isidro, Labrador de Madrid*; XXI, 1, comma after *flor* (cf. XXVI), 7, *Estas* for *Estos*, 9, *las* for *los*; XXIII, 14, *les* for *le*; XXXIV and XXXV as a single song; XXXV, 20, exclamation point; XLI, 22, *Darále* for *Daralle*; XLVII, 45, comma; LIV, 1, comma after *parabienes*; LIX, without 27-28 (*Todo . . . así*), not part of the song itself but merely an aside by an interested auditor, and after 34, the omitted—*Pinabelo y Celia*.—*Almendras y Anís*; LXI, end, an omitted *copla* of 16 verses (cf. Acad. VIII, 426b) and a third reprise of the 5 verse *estribillo*; LXII, 45, *se* for *no*, 51, *nueva* for *nuevo*; LXIII, after 83, proper space and the omitted *Guárdate, niña, del toro—Que* (*passim*, not *que*) *a mí mal ferido me ha* which corresponds to 72-73, 102 and 111, commas after each *parta* and semicolons after each *as*, after 102, an omitted *Toca las trompetas, as* (period) corresponding to 112 (cf. Acad. N., and Montesinos), 103, *Donde* (*as* at 113), 110, *abrasarás* for *abrazarás*; LXIV, 17, *miente* for *mienten*; LXV, 6, comma after *peto, espaldar* for *espaldas*; LXVI, 4, *favor* for *labor*, 23, without the inconsistent dash before *¿De* (cf. 39), 24 (and *passim*) *Panamá* for *Panama*, 57, period, 58, dash as elsewhere after *Panamá*, 89, period, 98, *que* for *Que* (cf. 74); LXVII, 35, comma after *niña*, 64, *mi* for *me*; LXIX, 4, 6, 12, 14, *Vamos* for *vamos*, 6, 8, 14, dashes (cf. LXVI); LXXII, 2, *Trébole* for *trébole*; LXXVI, LXXVII and LXXVIII as a single song (cf. p. 7 and LXXXIII); LXXVII, comma after *soto*; LXXXIII 2, colon as at 10; CVI, 9, *tendrá alegría* for *podrá alegrarse*; CVIII, 1, comma after *pastores* (cf. 11); CIX, 1, without comma (cf. 5), 11, with comma (cf. 3); CXII, 1, *Corderita* for *Cordera*, 9, *tenéis* for *tienes*; CXVIII, as does even Hartzenbusch, 5, *Siguiéndola* for *Siguiéndolas*, 8, *codició* for *contempló*; CXXVI, 3, *y en* for *en*, 11, *le* for *les*; CXXVIII, 8, *dos* for *las*; CXXX, 5, *Que* for *Qué*; CXXXI, 5, *pedillos* for *pedilles*; CXXXIV, 5, 7, *Cual* for *cuál*, 9, *las* for *la*; CXXXVI, title of play, *son todos* for *todos son*; CXXXVII, 10, comma after *perejil*.

C. E. ANIBAL

Ohio State University

L. Tieck, The German Romanticist. By EDWIN H. ZEYDEL.
Princeton: Princeton University Press for the University of
Cincinnati, 1935. Pp. xvi + 406. \$3.50.

Zeydel's admirable book is a comprehensive summary of Tieck's rather neglected and misrepresented personality. The conclusions are based on a considerable amount of new and unpublished material; traditional errors in dates and facts are carefully corrected; the scientific accuracy, the extensive references to the background of his field, the skill in linking scattered notions make his critical study almost a handbook of information.

Zeydel traces the development of the poet through Rationalism, Romanticism, and Realism and fortunately emphasizes Tieck's deep connection with the so-called "Biedermeier" age (p. 275). He also puts emphasis upon the dramatic flair of some of the earliest writings. Zeydel's interpretation of *Abschied* (p. 29 ff.) marks a distinct change in the usual attitude toward *Schicksal* and *Schicksalsdrama*. He re-establishes Tieck as translator and editor of Shakespeare, he shows his intense knowledge of English literature, his very definite imprint upon the German theatre, his stimulating interest in the Middle High German period, the primarily aesthetic touch in Tieck's catholicism, the influence of mysterious forces in his writings.

For some unknown reason Zeydel did not touch more distinctly on the influence the secret societies and the trash literature of the eighteenth century had on Tieck. The researches of F. J. Schneider (*Die Freimaurerei und ihr Einfluss auf die geistige Kultur in Deutschland am Ende des 18. Jahrhunderts*, Prag 1909) of M. Pirker (*Euphorion* xx, 261 ff.) and of M. Thalmann (*Der Trivialroman und der romantische Roman*, Berlin 1923) explored this problem pretty thoroughly, and especially Tieck's library, well-known to Zeydel (*L. Tieck and England*, 1931 and *MLN*, Jan. 1927, 21 ff.), would allow sound conclusions concerning this subject. It is surprising and at the same time instructive to know that some hundred volumes of trash literature were carefully collected by Tieck in addition to valuable editions and first printings. That cannot be explained by Tieck's dainty bibliophilism, but is one of his very personal eccentricities. The names of C. G. Cramer, J. A. Fessler, C. Grosse, A. Lafontaine, A. G. Meissner, B. Naubert, V. Weber, Mrs. Radcliffe, M. G. Lewis are distinctly connected with the first literary conception of secret societies and mysterious forces. Zeydel missed his opportunity of adding an empirical proof to the theories on romantic indebtedness to the trash literature and it is to be regretted that he did not emphasize that trait in Tieck's development.

Nevertheless, Zeydel has become Tieck's critical biographer. The

dangerous experiment, as it may seem, of basing a critical study almost entirely on facts of life turns out to be successful. Tieck's personality presented an unsolved problem. Zeydel's delightful comprehension of the problem of duality, of shifting ideas and changes in him, of opportunism and so-called chameleonism enables us to see L. Tieck's character and development as a whole, enables us to see the mind and the man. He states with outstanding honesty the weakness and the strength of the poet's personality. This approach lends to his life and writings the missing unity. The merit of Zeidel's book is to have solved the problem of a "problematic figure" and to call our attention to the "urbane style" of "a city-bred man" and "first metropolitan poet of Germany."

We have to realize that even the "mondbeglänzte Zaubernacht," the love of woods and silvery waves, the yearning for solitude, the glory of knighthood, and castle ruins are a product of metropolitan centers and reflect a metropolitan society. German literature as it has developed since those days would be unthinkable without this metropolitan spirit.

This volume supplies the requisite materials for further discussion on the subject.

MARIANNE THALMANN

Wellesley College

Widsith. Edited by KEMP MALONE. London: Methuen and Co., 1936. Pp. xiv + 202. 10 sh. 6 d. (Methuen's Old English Library.)

The results of Professor Malone's long devotion to the elucidation of *Widsith* are now available in a compact volume that is courageous and illuminating. It is not to be expected that all his conclusions will meet with assent; the close packed matter of the poem, our all too fragmentary knowledge of the centuries of history and story it crowds into less than a hundred and fifty lines, and the large accumulation of scholarship that has dealt with the resulting problems render finality out of the question. Appropriately dedicated to R. W. Chambers to whom all students of *Widsith* are so deeply indebted, the present volume has conclusions of its own to offer, both as to the growth and the structure of the poem and the identity of some of the kings and peoples whose memory it enshrines.

Developing the views of Brandl and Heusler, Professor Malone sees as the oldest matter in the poem the three catalogues, each with its peculiar formula, one of peoples, one of rulers and their peoples, and a third of names not limited, in the view which Professor Malone sensibly adopts, to the retainers of Eormannic. In these he finds very little that is not genuine old stuff of the sixth

century. Such unpromising folk as the Moide, Perse, Amothingas and (M)ofdingas are with varying plausibility identified as Germanic tribes; Beadeca and Hehca become credible kinsmen of Eormanric; only the obviously classical names in lines 82-83 and lines 34, 114, and 118, because their pattern differs from the stark regularity that surrounds them, are marked as interpolations.

These three lists Professor Malone then conceives to have come to the hand of an English poet of the late seventh century, who prepared for them a carefully balanced setting, an introduction and a conclusion, rounding out the first with the freely composed episodes of Offa and Heorot and the third with similar episodes of Wulfhere, Wudga, and Hama. From the formulas "*ic was mid*" and "*sohte ic*" the poet caught the idea of a long-lived minstrel into whose mouth he places the whole expanded poem and who in the second section celebrates his own prowess in song and the rewards he received at the hands of Guthere the Burgundian, Aelfwine (Alboin) the Lombard, and Eormanric the Goth and the lady Ealhild.

With Ealhild scholars have had their difficulties. Was she a princess of the Myrgings, Widsith's own people, or a daughter of Audoin (Eadwine) and so sister of Alboin the Lombard, and was it in her train, the destined bride of Eormanric, that Widsith journeyed? The poem has been understood in both ways, and from either interpretation it follows that there was an old poem in which Widsith, Ealhild, and Eormanric and his retainers were inextricably associated, the authentic *Widsith*. This view Professor Malone boldly discards. By interpreting *mid Ealhilde* (l. 5) as modifying, not *he*, but *Hreðcyninges ham*, he makes Ealhild the wife of Eormanric, so to speak, *ealle prage*, at whose court on his first and most memorable journey Widsith was received by her, sang before her, and bore away his reward. Not everyone will feel certain that the text can support this construction, though Professor Malone cites parallels. If he is right in this and in understanding *wraþes wærlogan* as "hostile to treaty breakers," thus avoiding dispraise of Eormanric who is later praised, then it must be admitted that Professor Malone has built up a clear and consistent interpretation of the most ancient poetical monument in our language that increases our respect for the poet who put it together as a skilful handler of his materials and for the materials themselves as representing on the whole what was truly remembered of early times. The editor's copiously and ingeniously applied learning, seeking always to explain the text as it stands rather than to amend or to suspect interpolation, does make of it a more intelligible and a better poem. The fulness of the textual notes, the bibliography, and the glossary of proper names furnish all that is needed on which to base doubt or disagreement; but there can be neither doubt nor disagreement over the fact that

Professor Malone has handled difficult matters thoroughly and stimulatingly, and made a distinguished advance in a long and honorable scholarly tradition.

HARRY MORGAN AYRES

Columbia University

Die Weltanschauung Jonathan Swifts. By MAX ARMIN KORN. Jena: Biedermann, 1935. Pp. 143. M. 6.75. (Forschungen zur Englischen Philologie, 4.)

Jonathan Swift: Gedanken und Schriften über Religion und Kirche. By HANS REIMERS. Hamburg: Friederichsen, de Gruyter, 1935. Pp. 194. M. 8.50. (Britannica, 9.)

The Letters of Jonathan Swift to Charles Ford. Edited by DAVID NICHOL SMITH. Oxford: The Clarendon Press [New York: Oxford University Press], 1935. Pp. xlviii + 260. \$5.00.

The Drapier's Letters to the People of Ireland. Edited by HERBERT DAVIS. Oxford: The Clarendon Press [New York: Oxford University Press], 1935. Pp. xcvi + 400. \$7.00.

Die Weltanschauung Jonathan Swifts is a very interesting attempt at a comprehensive statement of Swift's intellectual significance. The chief importance of this monograph lies not so much in the definitions which it offers,—for with certain of these one must take issue,—as in the author's attitude: he approaches his subject in an admirable spirit, for he is aware of Swift's seriousness, of the many facets of Swift's thought, and of the fact that there are far-reaching historical implications.

Of the five chapters of this book, those treating of Swift's position regarding Church and State (III), Swift's social and political thought (IV), and Swift's historical assumptions and consciousness (V) are thorough-going and sound. But the crucial chapter is the second—"Gott und Mensch (Das religionsphilosophische Weltbild)." Here one finds Swift's anti-intellectualism, his hatred of enthusiasm, his ethical seriousness, and his pessimism regarding mankind clearly identified; and it is in relation to these that his religious thought and his attitude towards man are defined. One becomes uncomfortable only when the author seeks to explain Swift against the background of European thought. Particularly inept are the pages devoted to the history of sceptical and pessimistic thought; and one passage (p. 46), in which Swift's Houyhnhnms are brought into relation with Montaigne, calls aloud for detailed and emphatic correction.

Swift's religion is a subject from which the biographers and critics of the great Dean have been in the habit of shying away, usually

contenting themselves with a few sweeping observations that reach nowhere. A few years ago, it is true, a certain English writer ventured to close with this subject, but the ineptitude of certain of his remarks—he maintained that the *Project For The Advancement of Religion* is ironic throughout—merely emphasized the extraordinary difficulties which Swift's religious position holds even for those possessing special knowledge of the Augustan Age. *Jonathan Swift: Gedanken und Schriften über Religion und Kirche* is not only the most comprehensive treatment of Swift's religion thus far to appear, but as a critical and historical study it is well-considered, assured, and ripe.

In the course of his book the author summarizes and analyzes almost all of Swift's writings on religion and the Church, and never once, it should be said, does he mistake Swift's tone or miss the subtle shades of meaning. It is apropos of his general observations on the intellectual history of the times and Swift's relations thereto that one would like to argue with him—not to challenge roundly, not to refute in any downright manner, but in behalf now of a somewhat different interpretation of the thought of the period and again of a different emphasis upon certain of Swift's attitudes. For instance, a sharper definition of the characteristic rationalism of the Enlightenment would bring out more fully the significance of Swift's hatred of enthusiasm—so important in his treatment of Dissenters—and of his anti-intellectualism—the basis of his formal religious position. (Here, too, one could get at the error which lies in the observation, p. 37, that in *The Battle of the Books* Swift was in opposition to the spirit of the Enlightenment because he attacked science.) One would like to break down the sharp contrast which the writer develops between Swift "the rationalist," withholding assent to the dogmas of his Church, and Swift the practical moralist, perfervidly conforming to the Church as a social institution. But most of all one would like to insist that Swift's attitude towards the Church—he was a Tory devoted to the Church rather than a High Churchman—is to be understood only by observing how in his religious pamphlets of 1708-1709 he strove to define for himself a position lying mid-way between the extreme State-Church of the violent Whigs and the equally extreme Church-State of the resurgent Queen Anne Tories.

The two splendid volumes recently issued by the Clarendon Press—Professor D. Nichol Smith's edition of Swift's letters to Charles Ford, and Professor Davis's edition of the *Drapier's Letters*—are permanent additions to the essential library of every student of Swift. It would be superfluous to hold forth upon the high order of scholarship which the editors have brought to their respective tasks. It will be enough to point out the general significance of these two volumes and to mention the more important facts which Professors Smith and Davis have brought to light in the course of their researches.

Swift and Charles Ford, an Englishman born in Ireland, became friends before the end of 1707, and from then on they saw much of one another and corresponded until the late 1730's, by which time Ford had ceased to reside in Ireland and had established himself for good in London. Of the letters which passed between them comparatively few have hitherto been known: eighteen from Ford to Swift were printed in the eighteenth century and reprinted by F. Elrington Ball in the *Correspondence*; but of Swift's letters to Ford, Ball gave only one in full (June 22, 1736) and fragments from two others (June 29, 1733 and [August 10, 1733]). The correspondence now edited by Professor Smith consists of fifty letters from Swift to Ford, of which only that of June 22, 1736, has previously been printed—for the sake of completeness Professor Smith includes the eighteen known letters from Ford to Swift. These new letters of Swift extend from the close of 1708 down to June, 1736. The most interesting are those which Swift wrote in June, July, and August, 1714, when he was observing from his retreat in Letcombe the death-throes of the Tory Ministry, and those of 1721, '22, '24, and '25, in which he commented upon his progress with *Gulliver's Travels*. However, save for their disclosures concerning the composition of *Gulliver's Travels*, these letters add nothing of first importance to our knowledge of the details of Swift's life and work. Thus, what he wrote to Ford during the weeks preceding and following the Queen's death brings us closer to the breathless events then being enacted, but tells us little that we did not know before. And again, although Ford was probably the only one of Swift's friends who knew all the facts concerning both Stella and Vanessa,—Stella and Mrs. Dingley, it will be remembered, spent the summer following Vanessa's death (1723) with Ford at the latter's Irish residence, Woodpark,—the correspondence throws no light upon the history of either woman. Nevertheless, no seasoned student of Swift will regard these letters as disappointing, for they afford precisely what is most needed for a sane estimate of the author—insight into his every-day kindliness, charm, and good-sense. The misconception of Swift the man which began with Orrery, found classical expression in Thackeray's lecture, and still appears in preposterous critical studies like *Swift or The Egoist* is not going to last forever. Its disappearance will be hastened by *The Letters of Jonathan Swift to Charles Ford*.

It is a stroke of the greatest luck that while he was writing *Gulliver's Travels* Swift kept Ford posted regarding the progress of the work, for had he not done so the history of the composition of the great satire would probably never have been known. Since 1919, when Sir Charles Firth delivered his famous paper on "The Political Significance of *Gulliver's Travels*" (*Proceedings of The British Academy*, 1919-1920), the essential facts have been acces-

sible to students, and in 1926 they were restated by Mr. Harold Williams in his Introduction to the reprint of the first edition of *G's. T.* It gives one great satisfaction, nevertheless, to have at one's command for the first time the actual source of this new information.

In addition to the letters themselves, Professor Smith gives for the first time Ford's Latin verses for Stella's birthday in 1726, Ford's Latin poem for Swift's birthday in 1727, and the two poems—hitherto garbled into one—which Swift wrote on the occasion of Stella's visit at Woodpark in 1723. And on the basis of the correspondence it is shown that the *Enquiry into the Behaviour of the Queen's Last Ministry* was not finished till 1721, that *The Right of Precedence between Physicians and Civilians* must be removed from the Swift canon, and that Swift's authorship of *The Puppet Show* is questionable.

Professor Davis's edition of the *Drapier's Letters* is a magnificent piece of work. How badly such an edition was needed has long been apparent. Though the great services rendered by Temple Scott as editor of the collected *Prose Works* will never be forgotten, his labours must be regarded as having but pointed the way to future editors. The Smith and Guthkelch edition of *A Tale of A Tub* and *The Battle of the Books* (1920) may be said to represent the first volume of the definitive edition of Swift's prose writings. The second volume is this containing the *Drapier's Letters*. In time, it is devoutly to be hoped, other volumes will follow, for there is much to be done—especially to be desired is a new edition of the political writings and the pamphlets on Church and State.

Thanks to Professor Davis's exhaustive researches, we now have for the first time the full and accurate history of the *Drapier's Letters* and the events which called them forth. The *First Letter*, which previously was believed to have been issued in April, 1724, was planned and written as early as February, though it may not have been printed until March. Regarding its composition, it seems that Swift had more advice from his friends than has hitherto been suspected. Concerning the *Second Letter* (early August), the *Third* (late August), and the *Fourth* (*A Letter to the Whole People of Ireland*, ptd. Oct. 22) there has never been much confusion, but there has been a great deal in regard to the events which took place in the following November. At Carteret's insistence the Privy Council, on Oct. 27, began the prosecution of Harding, the printer of the *Fourth Letter*, and issued a Proclamation against the Drapier. Swift, who was secretly informed of the deliberations of the Council, now wrote the *Letter to Lord Chancellor Midleton* (dated Oct. 26, but first ptd. as *Letter VI* in Swift's *Works*, vol. iv, 1735), but was dissuaded from publishing it. On November 14, however, he distributed through the post his *Seasonable Advice*, addressed to the Grand Jury before whom

Harding's case was to come. But Harding was never prosecuted; instead, the government attempted to obtain a presentment of the *Seasonable Advice*, and it was the Jury's refusal to find this paper of a seditious nature that caused its dismissal by Lord Chief Justice Whitshed. A new Grand Jury was summoned, but when on the last day of the term (Sat., Nov. 28) it was given an opportunity of making a presentment of the *Seasonable Advice*, it made instead a presentment "of all such persons as have attempted, or shall endeavour by fraud or otherwise, to impose the said halfpence upon us"—for this presentment Swift himself was probably directly responsible. The *Fifth Letter*, addressed to Lord Molesworth, appeared Dec. 31. The last *Letter* (ptd. as *Letter VII* in the *Works*, 1735) was written during the summer of 1725, but with the news of the surrender of the Patent its publication was abandoned.

This, very briefly, is the newly revealed history of the *Drapier's Letters*. Unfortunately, nothing can here be said of Professor Davis's notes and appendices, which are almost as exciting as his Historical Introduction.

RICARDO QUINTANA

The University of Wisconsin

Georgic Tradition in English Poetry. By DWIGHT L. DURLING. New York: Columbia University Press, 1935. Pp. xii + 259. \$3.00. (Columbia University Studies in English and Comparative Literature, CXXI.)

Aspects of Eighteenth-Century Nature Poetry. By C. V. DEANE. Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1935. Pp. 145. 7sh. 6d.

The Sublime: a Study of Critical Theories in XVIII-Century England. By SAMUEL H. MONK. New York: Modern Language Association of America, 1935. Pp. viii + 252. (Modern Language Association General Series.)

Enthusiasm in English Poetry of the Eighteenth Century (1700-1774). By SISTER M. K. WHELAN. Washington, D. C.: Catholic University of America, 1935. Pp. viii + 169. (Catholic University of America dissertation.)

In his *Georgic Tradition in English Poetry*, Mr. Durling traces the history of a once popular and long-lived genre, illustrating with a wealth of material the vogue and transformations of the type. He is thus able to show the work of important writers like Thomson and Cowper in clearer perspective, and even to make some pertinent suggestions about nineteenth-century poetry. In

addition, he explains in terms of the prevailing ideas modifications in the traditional themes.

It is not likely that Mr. Durling has missed many relevant items in his study, yet the plan of presentation comes very close to converting opulence into a condition of want amidst plenty. His practice of giving in chronological order a brief account of nearly every poem that falls within his established categories results in a series of independent essays, rather loosely classified, in which anything might be included that can be said about the poem considered by itself, even though it does not necessarily follow that all this will be relevant to a study of the genre as such. Moreover, where the history of ideas is involved, no consistency is maintained since the various threads are followed intermittently in connection with particular poems. Mr. Durling further complicates his problems by being too regularly the informal critic as well as the historian, for, theoretical objections aside, the former rôle is frequently an embarrassment: nothing much is gained by frequent recital of such observations as that "Dinsdale is an indifferent versifier," "Tighe is fatally diffuse," etc. Discussion of dull writings can be made interesting only by means of striking interpretative ideas. Critical recognition of the dulness, an attitude of indulgence, even occasional whimsicality, help merely as palliatives. Mr. Durling's account often reads like a brave *Odyssey* through the *Lotos Land* of ennui and the *Hades* of dead poems; and although it contains much valuable information and comment, it seems rather a monument to the industrious worthies who believed too naively that in the imitation of an ancient traditional form there was artistic security, and that poetry should instruct though with pleasure.

Mr. Deane's study of eighteenth century nature poetry escapes some of these difficulties, for the aim being primarily critical appreciation, only those specimens of such poetry are considered which illustrate the art of this style at its best. Mr. Deane takes the cue for his estimates of this poetry from the two most frequently raised objections against it—its conventional diction, and its confusion of the distinct provinces of painting and poetry. He considers the manner in which conventional diction may be used as an aid in generalizing the description and as background for the local touches, and he shows that the conventional devices are not inimical to exact observations of nature. In disputing the common criticism that eighteenth-century nature poets confused the arts of poetry and painting, Mr. Deane argues, on the one hand, that the recent theories concerning the influence of picturesque painting on descriptive verse distort matters by considering inferior as well as good poetry on the same level, and, on the other, that Lessing's objections to "static" descriptions of nature are unsatisfactory on theoretical grounds or on practical ones too when applied to many examples of such poetry. These are the main features of an in-

teresting attempt to provide a basis for a better understanding of a much abused style of poetry. Mr. Deane is best in occasional intelligently appreciative remarks. On the theoretical side he raises uncertainties. At times he wishes these poets viewed in terms of "what they set out to do," and at others he eschews the relativistic position in the search for their "absolute merits"; and, although for the most part the latter position dominates, he never quite makes it clear in terms of what critical principles these "absolute merits" are to be measured.

On the theoretical problems of eighteenth-century literature, Samuel Monk's work on the sublime is an important addition. The discussions of the sublime during the eighteenth century touch on almost every phase of critical theory and taste, and the task of dealing with the various ramifications and developments of this important current of esthetic speculation is considerable. Moreover, the writers on the sublime are not for the most part to be admired for their clarity and consistency. It is therefore no inconsiderable achievement that Mr. Monk's treatment of this conception and of its related ideas is on the whole discriminating and clear.

In order to give some directing focus to his study, Mr. Monk devotes his introduction largely to an analysis of Kant's theory of the sublime, as a kind of limit toward which the discussions of the eighteenth century might be thought to be approaching. Fortunately, he generally disregards this point of focus, and the fact that he escapes serious errors in perspective as a result of a teleological approach in a field so wide shows that the device is not essential to his plan. Indeed, he is the first to be concerned lest he oversimplify too much and thus through the need of organizing "give to the subject a symmetry that is entirely false." Any organization, however, does violence to the actualities of any moment in history, and a greater rigidity of form might have helped to eliminate some of the needless repetition and lack of emphasis which sometimes result from the chronologically arranged summaries of separate works.

For the eighteenth century, the sublime, according to Mr. Monk, became a welcome theoretical justification for many vagaries of taste which did not fit into the strictly neo-classical scheme. This view, though not incorrect, tends to obscure an important distinction. For one thing, it emphasizes unduly the inflexibility of the older esthetic theories. The variety of meanings implicit in the normative term "nature," the relativism occasionally admitted on racial, nationalistic, or climatic grounds, the distinction made or implied by certain critics between the general ideal of rule and "the rules," etc., permitted considerable extension of the scope of the standard doctrines. It is significant that, without departing in any basic philosophical respects from the traditional theories,

Johnson was able to defend Shakespeare from many of the criticisms which those very theories had raised against his plays. The inference to be drawn is not that Mr. Monk exaggerates the distinction between the two schools of esthetics, but that in spite of neglecting the possibility for subtleties in the one, he never establishes sharply the philosophical differences between them. The serious limitation of the idea of the sublime as a critical principle is that it cannot, strictly speaking, concern itself with a work of art as an organic whole, for it applies only to those occasional experiences for which the term "sublime," however defined, can be applied. Accordingly, the theory relates to special aspects only of a work of art, or to the object of imitation suggested by it, or to the moral or psychological structure of man and his response to great objects or ideas. How far these considerations separate the idea of the sublime from much of neo-classical criticism can be seen by comparing Johnson's assertion that Shakespeare's greatness is not in the splendor of particular passages but in the progress of his fable, with Blair's statement that the utmost we can expect is that sublimity may flash upon us occasionally like lightning.

Such reservations, however, should not be allowed to weigh too heavily against the value of Mr. Monk's study. It is rich in information and full of illuminating suggestions; it represents a useful and interesting contribution to an important question.

An analogous, though more restricted, territory is surveyed in Sister Whelan's book on enthusiasm. This study shows familiarity with the scholarship and the original materials, but not much acuteness in dealing with ideas. For example, the author interprets the assertion that reason is secondary to faith though an aid to it, a common Anglican compromise, as a revolt against religious formalism; primitivism, because it appears in "enthusiastic" poetry, she considers a necessary symptom of romanticism; she asserts the influence of Shaftesbury frequently and uncritically. She does not distinguish between conventional themes and individual sentiments (*cf.* "Solitude and Retirement"). She takes no account of benevolism and the cult of sensibility. And such confusions are intensified by the author's search for early traces of romanticism, a pursuit which, in view of her familiarity with recent scholarship, we might have expected to find conducted with less zeal and more wisdom.

M. E. PRIOR

Northwestern University

The Works of Thomas Lovell Beddoes. Edited with an Introduction by H. W. DONNER. London [and New York]: Oxford University Press. 1935. Pp. lxiv + 834. \$8.75.

Mr. Donner, the third of Beddoes's important editors, admits the value of the work done by the first, which indicates his honesty in a confused field. He acknowledges that we owe to Kelsall biographical facts and the text which preserved Beddoes from oblivion. Mr. Donner's own contribution is three-fold. He has had access to the transcripts allegedly made in 1886 by Dykes Campbell of the material which vanished with the famous "Browning Box" at the time of "Pen" Browning's death in Asolo. On page 691 *et seq.* and page 791 and in the Introduction (li) he describes this material and Dykes Campbell's method of transcription. From the material Mr. Donner is able to present approximately one hundred hitherto unpublished pieces or fragments. These do not present a new Beddoes but when one considers that Gosse's edition of 1890 produced ten new pieces, and his edition of 1929 added little beyond the juvenile *Scaroni* and one letter written when Beddoes was aged fourteen, the interest of Mr. Donner's contribution becomes obvious. More important, however, Mr. Donner has published the Variorum edition of *Death's Jest-Book* which Sir Edmund Gosse stated was available and did not publish. On page 321 Mr. Donner dates and numbers the Mss. and from there proceeds to print his Variorum. A comparison with the Kelsall text compels one to admiration of Kelsall's ingenuity in making sense of and preserving most of the best of the poetry of his rather mad and careless friend. Taking Act I, Scene III as an example, one finds that from Mss. III (dated between 1838 and 1844) Kelsall at the start has removed two lyrics and a blank verse passage which duly appear in his edition as independent units (Kelsall I, 171; I, 119; I, 191) Kelsall then proceeds with the scene, and a hasty collation of his text with Mr. Donner's variorum shows that although Kelsall was professedly following the latest text (Mss. III 1838-44) he actually opened with thirty-nine lines from Mss. II (1829). He then shifted to Mss. III for his main text but there are about twenty to twenty-five variants (twenty-two was my figure but I collated hastily), Kelsall sometimes substituting words or phrases from Mss. II for those of Mss. III, sometimes merely deleting from Mss. III. Mr. Donner has therefore made available for the scholar the material with which Kelsall worked, but Beddoes, to the intelligent reading public, will remain Kelsall's creation—his editorial "doctoring" of the text appearing to be clearly justified by the material and the result.

Mr. Donner's second contribution is his attack on the German field, and his third is the addition of some ten hitherto unpublished letters. The German material confirms what was already

known of Beddoes's political opinions. It is therefore no surprise, but it is the first concrete body of material to be reprinted, and it includes both prose and poetry. Of the new letters eight are trivial, XLV and LVI with the material given in the notes (pp. 770, 773-4) throw new light on Beddoes's difficulties in Wurzburg in 1832 and Zurich in 1839. An important satire in German (p. 145 *et seq.*) should be noted in this connection.

ROYALL H. SNOW

Ohio State University

Studies in Early Celtic Nature Poetry. By KENNETH JACKSON.

Cambridge: at the University Press, and New York: The Macmillan Company, 1935. Pp. xii + 204. \$3.75.

The first section of Mr. Jackson's book is devoted to translations of what, as he says, "has come to be called the 'early Celtic nature poetry.'" These are Irish and Welsh poems of the early period "up to about the twelfth and thirteenth centuries."¹ Many of the poems have never been properly translated, some have never been translated at all. Mr. Jackson has made his own translations of all of them, and in so doing he has had the advice and assistance of distinguished Welsh and Irish scholars, so that it may safely be assumed that the translations are as accurate as the present stage of Celtic scholarship permits. In the notes to the Irish poems he refers to works in which the original texts are printed, gives us the probable dates and the context, and discusses the earlier translations and his departures from them. For the Welsh poems he gives the dates but, except in two cases, no other references except to his recent *Early Welsh Gnomie Poems*. It would have been convenient if he had repeated here at least his references to works printing the original texts.

The second and larger part of the book is devoted to a discussion of the poems. Mr. Jackson holds that these poems do not constitute a class of nature poetry, that they are of diverse origins, and that many of them are not, properly speaking, nature poetry at all. His object is to determine "what really are the different kinds of poetry that have been included under this name, what sort of people composed them, and what was their purpose." The truest nature poetry he finds to be the production of the Irish hermits of the eighth, ninth, and tenth centuries. The hermit lived close to nature and felt himself in harmony with it because both he and it were communing with God. Next come the elegiac poems in which

¹ Yet two of the Irish poems he dates as fourteenth century or later, and three more as fifteenth or sixteenth century; one of the Welsh poems he places in the last half of the fifteenth century.

the speaker, usually an old man, laments the hardships which he must suffer in his exile, and the Fenian poems which describe the glories and joys of the Fiana, and lament their loss. Somewhat more objective are the seasonal poems which center, for the most part, about the beginning of summer and the beginning of winter. It seems probable, although the external evidence is weak, that these developed from the seasonal festivals of *Céttamain* (*Kalan Mei*) and *Samhain* (*Kalan Gaeaf*). Continental literature affords interesting parallels but they are too late to have had any influence upon these Irish and Welsh poems. In Welsh we have also a type of gnomic poetry in which nature gnomes are found mixed with human gnomes. Mr. Jackson's theory of its development is too complex to be summed up here in a few words.

A study of the book leaves me with the feeling that, while it may not be correct to speak of Celtic nature poetry *per se*, yet the Celt of the early Middle Ages was apt to look upon nature with more pleasure and more sympathy than his neighbors did. Mr. Jackson feels this too, but he does not stress the point since his concern is to study the different types in which this feeling manifests itself. In so doing he brings out many things that are of interest to the student of Celtic poetry and to the student of poetry in general. But it is probable that long after his discussions have been digested we will continue to turn back to the book for the sake of the poems themselves.

JOHN J. PARRY

University of Illinois

BRIEF MENTION

De Quincey at Work. By WILLIARD HALLAM BONNER. Pp. 111. \$0.50. (The University of Buffalo Studies, xi, April, 1936. Monographs in English, 2.) This volume contains some 130 letters; all, but one to Hessey in 1823, falling within the last decade of De Quincey's life. About 100 are those curious notes from De Quincey to the Hoggs while they were publishing *Selections Grave and Gay*; all but one or two of the rest were written by De Quincey's daughters to Mr. and Mrs. James T. Fields and to some of the men connected with Ticknor and Fields while *De Quincey's Writings* were appearing in Boston. Altogether they give a vivid picture of De Quincey's last years—of his habits, attitudes and moods; and the letters of the daughters are not the least interesting. Most of this material sees light here for the first time, except for a few of the Hogg notes published by Japp and, almost synchronously with Professor Bonner's book, by me in my *Thomas De Quincey*.

Professor Bonner wisely prints the Fields correspondence as a unit; and in a separate section arranges the Hogg letters as far as possible chronologically. But most of these are undated, and Dr. Bonner has shown much ingenuity in bringing them to order. He has also written excellent introductions and notes.

De Quincey at Work is so good in general plan and execution that one wishes it were better in detail. One would have liked to know where the original of each letter may be found. We are merely told that originals are preserved in the Huntington Library, in the Buffalo Public Library, in my collection, etc. But a greater defect lies in the carelessness with which the letters are printed. The punctuation, in so far as I have checked with my own MSS., is very inaccurate; too many words have been dropped out in transcribing; and in certain places misreadings of the MS. occur—as, for example on page 88, where “Reputations” is twice given for “Refutations.” But these are obviously merely signs of haste in preparation, and we are all “vulnerable.” In spite of minor faults, the little book is valuable for the De Quincey specialist.

HORACE A. EATON

Syracuse University

The History of the English Novel. Vol. 7, The Age of Dickens and Thackeray. By ERNEST A. BAKER. London: H. F. & G. Witherby, 1936. Pp. 404. Sh. 16. This work grows monumental, and bids fair to reach a tenth volume before its conclusion. It might readily exceed that limit if its author were disposed to give to contemporary fiction the same amplitude of reference that he has devoted to the fiction of the past. We incline to the view that he will wisely refrain from that attempt, for his method leans upon authoritative opinion, and the modern chaos would confuse him. He has neither the jauntiness nor the courage of his predecessor, Saintsbury, and is less competent to generate views of his own.

But his lack of originality, though it may bring less refreshment to his pages, does not seriously impair the value of the work he has grimly determined to perform. We referred somewhat too hastily to his lack of courage. The incentive of pleasure might lead one to sift the winnowed masterpieces of the past, but only a brave man could venture among the graveyard remains of the dead centuries. His desire for thoroughness at all cost has made Dr. Baker less entertaining but definitely more valuable to the student of literature, who will learn from these pages what he may profitably avoid.

If there is nothing more dead than a dead book there is nothing more vital than a live one, and if we must make an adverse comment upon Dr. Baker's achievement it is that with respect to the admittedly great writers whom he presents he is not markedly

illuminating. He may say the right thing, but he rarely says the bright thing. He accepts opinion, but he never makes it, and the reason may be that he is more historical than aesthetic in his approach to the novel.

Dickens and Thackeray naturally control this volume, but there is an extremely good chapter on Peacock, Disraeli, and Lytton. The chapter that leads up to Dickens is to be commended for the author's adequate appraisal of the taste of that period of facetiae and trifles. It is difficult for us to realise how greatness could emerge from such conditions.

PELHAM EDGAR

University of Toronto

A Reference Guide to the Literature of Travel. Volume I (The Old World). By EDWARD G. COX. Seattle: University of Washington, 1935. Pp. x + 401. \$2.25. (University of Washington Publications in Language and Literature, ix.) This *Guide* is a descriptive list of travel works printed in England before 1800. The first volume arranges the items in chronological order under the following main headings: travel collections, circumnavigations, general travels and descriptions, Europe, Asia, Africa. It includes translations into English (except usually from the classics), citing the originals; it also includes foreign versions of English works. Important items are usefully identified and characterized. The utility of the volume is greatly increased by Addenda to each section which list important first editions and reprints after 1800. The second volume will, I understand, include not only voyages to the new world and the Pacific, but also military and naval expeditions, geographical works, and related materials like directions for travelers and imaginary voyages. Professor Cox plans a separate work on the British Isles.

No travel bibliography of this scope has ever before been attempted. Errors and omissions are therefore obvious to the specialist, inevitably so because the compiler has often had to rely on rather shaky authorities. But the value of the volume is undeniable. Students will be especially grateful for the record of travel collections, from the *Novus Orbis* of 1532 down to Pinkerton in 1808, and also for the noting of modern editions and retranslations of earlier works. The *Guide* takes an immediate place as a standard and valuable work of reference.

GEORGE B. PARKS

Washington University,
St. Louis

Marionettes in the North of France. By REGINALD S. SIBBALD. Philadelphia: 1936. Pp. x + 134. Univ. of Pa. diss. The first third of this work is a résumé of marionette history as recounted by Magnin, Campardon, Maindron, and others; the rest of it is devoted to the marionette theaters of Amiens, Lille, and Roubaix, more especially to the activities of Louis Richard and his son Léopold, who have composed some 800 pieces for this form of entertainment. Dr. S. knows his subject well and presents it in an interesting manner. He brings out clearly the popular character of the marionette-shows in the north, whose authors appear to have been unaffected by the notice taken of them at Paris. While he notes connections with Belgian marionettes, he denies that they had any influence on Maeterlinck and publishes (pp. 4, 5) a letter in which the dramatist assures him of that fact. I would suggest that the name La Fleur, given to the principal marionette of Amiens, may have some connection with the Parisian theater of the seventeenth century, as the name was then employed by two prominent actors of the Hôtel de Bourgogne. Dr. S. may also be interested to learn that marionettes dance a ballet and play a farce in the midst of Poisson's *Après-Soupe* (pub., 1665) and that Mayolas mentions a parody of Boyer's *Jupiter et Sémélé* that was given at Paris in February, 1666, by Francizin and his marionettes.

H. C. L.

Die Narrenspiele des neuentdeckten Mischbands von Trepperel-drucken. By PH. AUG. BECKER. Leipzig: Berichte über die Verhandlungen der Sächsischen Akademie der Wissenschaften zu Leipzig, Philologisch-historische Klasse, Band 87, Heft 2, 1935. Pp. 52. 2 RM. This is a study of the *Sotties* edited by E. Droz in 1935. Although a needlessly large amount of space is devoted to summarizing the plays and repeating the words of the editor regarding them, and although some of the "Verbesserungen" proposed by B. seem otiose and purely conjectural, nevertheless students of the late mediaeval theatre will find here various apposite generalizations, pertinent remarks about the dates of the plays and acceptable emendations of the texts.

G. F.

GUSTAV GRUENBAUM

1885-1937

The editors of MODERN LANGUAGE NOTES would express their sorrow over the death of Gustav Gruenbaum and their deep appreciation of the services he rendered both to the review and to the Johns Hopkins. Born at Bucharest in 1885, he received his early education there, attending the University of Bucharest, where one of his teachers was the distinguished historian, Nicholas Jorga. He came to this country early in 1904, received his Ph. D. degree at the Johns Hopkins in 1911, was instructor in that University until 1917, associate until 1926, associate professor until his sudden death on February 1, 1937. He was especially interested in the great Italian Classics, but he gave courses also in later Italian literature, in Italian dialects and historical grammar, in Old Spanish, and in Rumanian. He had collected a library of some ten thousand books, perhaps the most valuable private library dealing chiefly with Italian in the country. He became an associate editor of MODERN LANGUAGE NOTES in 1917, devoting his energies mainly to the Italian portion of the review. His knowledge of the Romance languages was extensive and profound. He was an admirable teacher, who won the devotion of his students as few are able to do. He set for himself a very high ideal of scholarship and rarely offered an opinion that he could not substantiate. He was eager to establish his facts, to interpret them, and to present his conclusions with scrupulous accuracy, while avoiding anything that might be understood as intended to advertise the interpreter. If he did not attain as a productive scholar the success that he had as a teacher, it was largely because intense self-criticism staid his hand. He had undertaken to publish two extensive studies in the field of the Italian Renaissance. If he had completed these, he would doubtless have made many others realize, as do his colleagues and students only too well, the loss that American scholarship has suffered in his death.

H. C. L.
